THE LIFE OF CHRIST

BY

DEAN F. W. FARRAR

J. A. Wolf

Candston

Alta

N. A. T

XMAS 1898.
"WE HOLD A VASTER EMPIRE THAN HAS BEEN"

THE LIFE OF CHRIST

BY

FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; MASTER OF MARLBOROUGH COLLEGE; CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO THE QUEEN, AND DEAN OF CANTERBURY

MANET IMMOTA FIDES

VOL. I.

NEW YORK: 46 EAST 14TH STREET

THOMAS Y. CROWELL & COMPANY

BOSTON: 100 PURCHASE STREET

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

VOLUME I.

	PAGE
GENERAL VIEW OF BETHLEHEM	*Frontispiece*
ENVIRONS OF BETHLEHEM	21
NAZARETH	59
THE RIVER JORDAN	98
CANA OF GALILEE	132
TIBERIUS	145
SAMARIA	170
NAIN	219
CAPERNAUM	310

PREFACE.

In fulfilling a task so difficult and so important as that of writing the Life of Christ, I feel it to be a duty to state the causes which led me to undertake it, and the principles which have guided me in carrying it to a conclusion.

1. It has long been the desire and aim of the publishers of this work to spread as widely as possible the blessings of knowledge; and, in special furtherance of this design, they wished to place in the hands of their readers such a sketch of the Life of Christ on earth as should enable them to realize it more clearly, and to enter more thoroughly into the details and sequence of the Gospel narratives. They therefore applied originally to an eminent theologian, who accepted the proposal, but whose elevation to the Episcopate prevented him from carrying it out.

Under these circumstances application was made to me, and I could not at first but shrink from a labor for which I felt that the amplest leisure of a lifetime would be insufficient, and powers incomparably greater than my own would still be utterly inadequate. But the considerations that were urged upon me came no doubt with additional force from the deep interest with which, from the first, I contemplated the design. I consented to make the effort, knowing that I could at least promise to do my best, and believing that he who does the best he can, and also seeks the blessing of God upon his labors, cannot finally and wholly fail.

And I have reason to be thankful that I originally entered upon the task, and, in spite of all obstacles, have still persevered in it. If the following pages in *any* measure fulfil the objects with which such a Life ought to be written, they should fill the minds of those who read them with solemn and not ignoble thoughts; they should "add sunlight to daylight by making the happy happier;" they should encourage the toiler; they should console the sorrowful; they should point the weak to the one true source of moral strength. But

whether this book be thus blessed to high ends, or whether it be received with harshness and indifference, nothing at least can rob me of the deep and constant happiness which I have felt during almost every hour that has been spent upon it. Though, owing to serious and absorbing duties, months have often passed without my finding an opportunity to write a single line, yet, even in the midst of incessant labor at other things, nothing forbade that the subject on which I was engaged should be often in my thoughts, or that I should find in it a source of peace and happiness different, alike in kind and in degree, from any which other interests could either give or take away.

2. After I had in some small measure prepared myself for the task, I seized, in the year 1870, the earliest possible opportunity to visit Palestine, and especially those parts of it which will be forever identified with the work of Christ on earth. Amid those scenes wherein He moved — in the

> "holy fields
> Over whose acres walked those blessed feet
> Which, eighteen hundred years ago, were nailed
> For our advantage, on the bitter cross" —

in the midst of those immemorial customs which recalled at every turn the manner of life He lived — at Jerusalem, on the Mount of Olives, at Bethlehem, by Jacob's Well, in the Valley of Nazareth, along the bright strand of the Sea of Galilee, and in the coasts of Tyre and Sidon — many things came home to me, for the first time, with a reality and vividness unknown before. I returned more than ever confirmed in the wish to tell the full story of the Gospels in such a manner and with such illustrations as — with the aid of all that was within my reach of that knowledge which has been accumulating for centuries — might serve to enable at least the simple and the unlearned to understand and enter into the human surroundings of the life of the Son of God.

3. But, while I say this to save the book from being judged by a false standard, and with reference to ends which it was never intended to accomplish, it would be mere affectation to deny that I have hoped to furnish much which even learned readers may value. Though the following pages do not pretend to be exhaustive or specially erudite, they yet contain much that men of the highest learning have thought or ascertained. The books which I have consulted include the researches of divines who have had the privilege of devoting to this subject, and often to some small fragment of it, the

best years of laborious and uninterrupted lives. No one, I hope, could have reaped, however feebly, among such harvests, without garnering at least something which must have its value for the professed theologian as well as for the unlearned. And because I believed — and indeed most earnestly hoped — that this book might be acceptable to many of my brother-clergymen, I have admitted into the notes some quotations and references which will be comparatively valueless to the ordinary reader. But, with this double aim in view, I have tried to avoid "moving as in a strange diagonal," and have never wholly lost sight of the fact that I had to work with no higher object than that thousands, who have even fewer opportunities than myself, might be the better enabled to read that one Book, beside which even the best and profoundest treatises are nothing better than poor and stammering fragments of imperfect commentary.

4. It is perhaps yet more important to add that this Life of Christ is avowedly and unconditionally the work of a believer. Those who expect to find in it new theories about the divine personality of Jesus, or brilliant combinations of mythic cloud tinged by the sunset imagination of some decadent belief, will look in vain. It has not been written with any *direct* and *special* reference to the attacks of sceptical criticism. It is not even intended to deal otherwise than indirectly with the serious doubts of those who, almost against their will, think themselves forced to lapse into a state of honest disbelief. I may indeed venture to hope that such readers, if they follow me with no unkindly spirit through these pages, may here and there find considerations of real weight and importance, which will solve imaginary difficulties and supply an answer to real objections. Although this book is not mainly controversial, and would, had it been intended as a contribution to polemical literature have been written in a very different manner, I do not believe that it will prove wholly valueless to any honest doubter who reads it in a candid and uncontemptuous spirit. Hundreds of critics, for instance, have impugned the authority of the Gospels on the score of the real or supposed contradictions to be found in them. I am, of course, familiar with such objections, which may be found in all sorts of books, from Strauss's *Leben Jesu* and Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, down to Sir R. Hanson's *Jesus of History*, and the English *Life of Jesus*, by Mr. Thomas Scott. But, while I have never consciously evaded a distinct and formidable difficulty, I have constantly endeavored to show by the mere silent course of the nar-

rative itself that many of these objections are by no means insuperable, and that many more are unfairly captious or altogether fantastic.

5. If there are questions wider and deeper than the minutiæ of criticism, into which I have not fully and directly entered, it is not either from having neglected to weigh the arguments respecting them, or from any unwillingness to state the reasons why, in common with tens of thousands who are abler and wiser than myself, I can still say respecting every fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith, MANET IMMOTA FIDES. Writing as a believer to believers, as a Christian to Christians, surely, after nearly nineteen centuries of Christianity, any one may be allowed to rest a fact of the Life of Jesus on the testimony of St. John without stopping to write a volume on the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel; or may narrate one of the Gospel miracles without deeming it necessary to answer all the arguments which have been urged against the possibility of the supernatural. After the long labors, the powerful reasoning, and the perfect historical candor with which this subject has been treated by a host of apologists, it is surely as needless as it is impossible to lay again, on every possible occasion, the very lowest foundations of our faith. As regards St. John, therefore, I have contented myself with the merest and briefest summary of some of the evidence which to me still seems adequate to prove that he was the author of the Gospel which passes by his name,[1] and minuter indications tending to strengthen that conviction will be found scattered throughout the book. It would indeed be hypocrisy in me to say with Ewald that "*every argument, from every quarter to which we can look, every trace and record,* combine together to render any serious doubt upon the question absolutely impossible;" but I do say that, after the fairest and fullest consideration which I have been able to give to a question beset with difficulties, the arguments in favor of the Johannine authorship seem to me to be immensely preponderant.

Nor have I left the subject of the crediblity of miracles and the general authenticity of the Gospel narratives entirely untouched, although there was the less need for my entering fully upon those questions in the following pages from my having already stated elsewhere, to the best of my ability, the grounds of my belief. The same remark applies to the

[1] See Vol. I., pp. 141, 142, *passim.*

yet more solemn truth of the Divinity of Christ. That — not indeed as surrounded with all the recondite inquiries about the *περιχώρησις* or *communicatio idiomatum*, the hypostatic union, the abstract impeccability, and such scholastic formulæ, but in its broad scriptural simplicity — was the subject of the Hulsean Lectures before the University of Cambridge in the year 1870. In those lectures I endeavored to sketch what has ever seemed to my mind the most convincing external evidence of our faith, namely "*The Witness of History to Christ.*" Those who have rejected the creed of the Church in this particular, approach the subject from a totally opposite point to our own. They read the earlier chapters of St. Luke and St. Matthew, and openly marvel that any mind can believe what to them appears to be palpable mythology; or they hear the story of one of Christ's miracles of power — the walking on the Sea of Galilee, or turning the water into wine — and scarcely conceal their insinuated misgiving as to the honesty of those who can accept such narratives as true. Doubtless we should share their convictions in these respects, if we approached the subject in the same spirit and by the same avenues. To show that we *do not* and *why* we do not so approach it, is — incidentally at least — one of the objects of this book.

The sceptic — and let me here say at once that I hope to use no single word of anger or denunciation against a scepticism which I know to be in many cases perfectly honest and self-sacrificingly noble — approaches the examination of the question from a point of view the very opposite to that of the believer. He looks at the majestic order and apparently unbroken uniformity of Law, until the Universe becomes to him but the result mechanically evolved from tendencies at once irreversible and self-originated. To us such a conception is wholly inconceivable. Law to us involves the necessity of postulating a Lawgiver, and "Nature," which we only use as an unscientific and imaginative synonym for the sum total of observed phenomena, involves in our conceptions the Divine Power of whose energy it is but the visible translucence. We believe that the God and Creator of "Nature" has made Himself known to us, if not by a primitive intuition, at any rate by immediate revelation to our hearts and consciences. And therefore such narratives as those to which I have alluded are not nakedly and singly presented to us in all their unsupported and startling difficulty. To us they are but incidental items in a faith that lies at the very basis of our being — they are but fragments of that great whole

which comprises all that is divine and mysterious and supernatural in the two great words, Christianity and Christendom. And hence, though we no longer prominently urge the miracles of Christ as the proofs of our religion, yet, on the other hand, we cannot regard them as stumbling-blocks in the path of an historical belief. We study the sacred books of all the great religions of the world; we see the effect exercised by those religions on the mind of their votaries; and in spite of all the truths which even the worst of them enshrined, we watch the failure of them all to produce the inestimable blessings which we have ourselves enjoyed from infancy, which we treasure as dearly as our life, and which we regard as solely due to the spread and establishment of the faith we hold. We read the systems and treatises of ancient philosophy, and in spite of all the great and noble elements in which they abound, we see their total incapacity to console, or support, or deliver, or regenerate the world. Then we see the light of Christianity dawning like a tender dayspring amid the universal and intolerable darkness. From the first, that new religion allies itself with the world's utter feeblenesses, and those feeblenesses it shares; yet without wealth, without learning, without genius, without arms, without anything to dazzle and attract — the religion of outcasts and exiles, of fugitives and prisoners — numbering among its earliest converts not many wise, not many noble, not many mighty, but such as the gaoler of Philippi, and the runaway slave of Colossæ — with no blessing apparently upon it save such as cometh from above — with no light whatever about it save the light that comes from heaven — it puts to flight kings and their armies; it breathes a new life, and a new hope, and a new and unknown holiness into a guilty and decrepit world. This we see; and we see the work grow, and increase, and become more and more irresistible, and spread "with the gentleness of a sea that caresses the shore it covers." And seeing this, we recall the faithful principle of the wise and tolerant Rabbi, uttered more than 1,800 years ago — "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God."

And when we have thus been led to see and to believe that the only religion in the world which has established the ideal of a perfect holiness, and rendered common the attainment of that ideal, has received in conspicuous measure the blessing of God, we examine its truths with a deeper reverence. The record of these truths — the record of that

teaching which made them familiar to the world — we find in the Gospel narrative. And that narrative reveals to us much more. It not only furnishes us with an adequate reason for the existence and for the triumphs of the faith we hold, but it also brings home to us truths which affect our hearts and intellects no less powerfully than "the starry heavens above and the moral law within." Taught to regard ourselves as children of God, and common brothers in His great family of man, we find in the Gospels a revelation of God in His Son which enables us to know Him more, and to trust Him more absolutely, and to serve Him more faithfully, than all which we can find in all the other books of God, whether in Scripture, or history, or the experience of life, or those unseen messages which God has written on every individual heart. And finding that this revelation has been recorded by honest men in narratives which, however fragmentary, appear to stand the test of history, and to bear on the face of them every mark of transparent simplicity and perfect truthfulness — prepared for the reception of these glad tidings of God's love in man's redemption by the facts of the world without, and the experiences of the heart within — we thus cease to find any overwhelming difficulty in the record that He whom we believe to have been the Son of God — He who alone has displayed on earth the transcendent miracle of a sinless life — should have walked on the Sea of Galilee or turned the water into wine.

And when we thus accept the truth of the miracles they become to us moral lessons of the profoundest value. In considering the miracles of Jesus we stand in a wholly different position to the earlier disciples. To them the evidence of the miracles lent an overwhelming force to the teachings of the Lord; they were as the seal of God to the proclamation of the new kingdom. But to us who, for nineteen centuries, have been children of that kingdom, such evidence is needless. To the Apostles they were the credentials of Christ's mission; to us they are but fresh revelations of His will. To us they are works rather than signs, revelations rather than portents. Their historical importance lies for us in the fact that without them it would be impossible to account for the origin and spread of Christianity. We appeal to them not to prove the truth of Christianity, but to illustrate its dissemination. But though to us Christianity rests on the basis of a Divine approval far more convincing than the display of supernatural power — though to us the providence which for these two millenniums has

ruled the destinies of Christendom is a miracle far more stupendous in its evidential force than the raising of the dead or the enlightenment of the blind — yet a belief in these miracles enables us to solve problems which would otherwise be insolvable, as well as to embrace moral conceptions which would otherwise have found no illustration. To one who rejects them — to one who believes that the loftiest morals and the divinest piety which mankind has ever seen were evoked by a religion which rested on errors or on lies — the world's history must remain, it seems to me, a hopeless enigma or a revolting fraud.[1]

6. Referring to another part of the subject, I ought to say I do not regard as possible any final harmony of the Gospels. Against *any* harmony which can be devised some plausible objection could be urged. On this subject no two writers have ever been exactly agreed, and this alone is sufficient to prove that the Gospel notices of chronology are too incomplete to render certainty attainable. I have, of course, touched directly, as well as indirectly, on such questions as the length of the ministry; and wherever the narrative required some clear and strong reason for adopting one view rather than another on some highly disputed point — such, for instance, as the Feast alluded to in John v. 1 — I have treated the question as fully as was consistent with brevity, and endeavored to put the reader in possession of the main facts and arguments on which the decision rests. But it would have been equally unprofitable and idle to encumber my pages with endless controversy on collateral topics which, besides being dreary and needless, are such as admit of no

[1] "Que la philosophie est ingénieuse et profonde dans ses conjectures!" writes De Lamennais in his scornful style. "Comme les événemens qui paraissaient les plus extraordinaires, deviennent simple dès qu'elle daigne les expliquer! Vous ne concevez pas que le christianisme se soit propagé naturellement: elle va vous le faire comprendre. Les Apôtres ont dit, 'Nous vous annonçons l'Évangile au nom de l'Éternel, et vous devez nous croire, car nous sommes doués du pouvoir miraculeux. Nous rendons la santé aux malades, aux perclus l'usage de leurs membres, la vue aux aveugles, l'ouie aux sourds, la vie aux morts.' A ce discours le peuple est accouru de toutes parts, pour être témoin des miracles promis avec tant de confiance. Les malades n'ont point été guéris, les perclus n'ont point marché, les aveugles n'ont point vu, les sourds n'ont point entendu, les morts n'ont point ressuscité. Alors, transporté d'admiration, le peuple est tombé aux pieds des Apôtres, et s'est écrié, 'Ceux-ci sont manifestement les envoyés de Dieu, les ministres de sa puissance!' et sur le champ brisant ses idoles, il a quitté le culte des plaisirs pour le culte de la croix; il a renoncé à ses habitudes, à ses préjugés, à ses passions; il a réformé ses mœurs et embrassé la pénitence; les riches ont vendu leurs biens, pour en distribuer le prix aux indigens, et tous ont préféré les plus horribles tortures et une mort infâme aux remords d'abandonner une religion qui leur était si solidement prouvée." (*Ess. sur l'Indifférence*, iv. 458.)

final settlement. In deciding upon a particular sequence of events, we can only say that such a sequence appears to us a *probable* one, not by any means that we regard it as *certain*. In every instance I have carefully examined the evidence for myself, often compressing into a few lines, or even into an incidental allusion, the results of a long inquiry. To some extent I agree with Stier and Lange in the order of events which they have adopted, and in this respect, as well as for my first insight into the character of several scenes (acknowledged in their place), I am perhaps more indebted to the elaborate work of Lange than to any others who have written on the same subject. When an author is writing from the results of independent thought on the sum total of impressions formed during a course of study, it is not always possible to acknowledge specific obligations; but whenever I was consciously indebted to others, I have, throughout the book, referred especially to Ewald, Neander, Schenkel, Strauss, Hase, Sepp, Stier, Ebrard, Wieseler, Hofmann, Keim, Caspari, Ullmann, Delitzsch, De Pressensé, Wallon, Dupanloup, Capecelatro, Ellicott, Young, Andrews, Wordsworth, Alford, and many others; as well as to older writers like Bonaventura and Jeremy Taylor. I have also to acknowledge the assistance which I have gained from the writings of Dean Stanley, Canons Lightfoot and Westcott, Professor Plumptre, Dr. Ginsburg, Mr. Grove, and the authors of articles in the Encyclopædias of Ersch and Grube, Herzog, Zeller, Winer, and Dr. W. Smith. Incidental lights have of course been caught from various archæological treatises, as well as works of geography and travel, from the old Itineraries and Reland down to Dr. Thomson's *Land and Book*, and Mr. Hepworth Dixon's *Holy Land*.

7. It is needless to add that this book is almost wholly founded on an independent study of the four Gospels side by side. In quoting from them I have constantly and intentionally diverged from the English version, because my main object has been to bring out and explain the scenes as they are described by the original witnesses. The minuter details of those scenes, and therewith the accuracy of our reproduction of them, depend in no small degree upon the discovery of the true reading, and the delicate observance of the true usage of words, particles, and tenses. It must not be supposed for a moment that I offer these translations — which are not unfrequently paraphrases — as preferable to those of the English version, but only that, consistently with the objects which I had in view, I have aimed at representing

with more rigid accuracy the force and meaning of the true text in the original Greek. It will be seen too that I have endeavored to glean in illustration all that is valuable or trustworthy in Josephus, in the Apocryphal Gospels, and in traditional particulars derived from the writings of the Fathers.

8. Some readers will perhaps be surprised by the frequency of the allusions to Jewish literature. Without embarking on "the sea of the Talmud" (as the Rabbis themselves call it) — a task which would require a lifetime — a modern reader may find not only the amplest materials, but probably *all* the materials it can offer for the illustration of the Gospel history, in the writings not of Christians only, but also of learned and candid Rabbis. Not only in the well-known treatises of Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Surenhuys, Wagenseil, Buxtorf, Otho, Reland, Budæus, Gfrörer, Herzfeld, McCaul, Etheridge, but also in those of Jews by birth or religion, or both, like Geiger, Jost, Grätz, Derenbourg, Munk, Frankl, Deutsch, Raphall, Schwab, Cohen, any one may find large quotations from the original authorities collected as well by adversaries as by reverent and admiring students. Further, he may read the entire Mishna (if he have the time and patience to do so) in the Latin version of Surenhusius, and may now form his judgment respecting large and important treatises even of the Gemara, from such translations as the French one of the Berachôth by M. Moïse Schwab. I have myself consulted all the authorities here named, and have gained from them much information which seems to me eminently useful. Their researches have thrown a flood of light on some parts of the Gospels, and have led me to some conclusions which, so far as I am aware, are new. I have, indeed, in the second Excursus of the Appendix, shown that nothing of the slightest importance can be gleaned from the Talmudists about our Lord Himself. The real value of the Rabbinic writings in illustrating the Gospels is indirect, not direct — archæological, not controversial. The light which they throw on the fidelity of the Evangelists is all the more valuable because it is derived from a source so unsuspected and so hostile.[1]

[1] I take this opportunity of saying that the reader will not find in the following pages any one rigid or uniform system of *transliteration* of Hebrew words into English. This is due to the fact that, in most instances, my references to the Talmud have been derived from the numerous sources mentioned in the above paragraphs, and in referring such passages to the author who is responsible for their accuracy, I have generally adopted his mode of spelling. Scripture names I have mostly left in the form in which they occur in our English version; and in many terms that have acquired

9. If in any part of this book I have appeared to sin against the divine law of charity, I must here ask pardon for it. But at least I may say that whatever trace of asperity may be found in any page of it, has never been directed against men, but against principles, or only against those men or classes of men in long-past ages whom we solely regard as the representatives of principles. It is possible that this book may fall into the hands of some Jewish readers, and to these particularly I would wish this remark to be addressed. I have reason to believe that the Jewish race have long since learned to look with love and reverence on Him whom their fathers rejected; nay, more, that many of them, convinced by the irrefragable logic of history, have openly acknowledged that he was indeed their promised Messiah, although they still reject the belief in His divinity. I see, in the writings of many Jews, a clear conviction that Jesus, to whom they have quite ceased to apply the terms of hatred found in the Talmud, was at any rate the greatest religious Teacher, the highest and noblest Prophet whom their race produced. They, therefore, would be the last to defend that greatest crime in history — the Crucifixion of the Son of God. And while no Christian ever dreams of visiting upon them the horror due to the sin of their ancestors, so no Jew will charge the Christians of to-day with looking with any feeling but that of simple abhorrence on the long, cruel, and infamous persecutions to which the ignorance and brutality of past ages have subjected their great and noble race. We may humbly believe that the day is fast approaching when He whom the Jews crucified, and whose divine revelations the Christians have so often and so grievously disgraced, will break down the middle wall of partition between them, and make both races one in religion, in heart and life — Semite and Aryan, Jew and Gentile, united to bless and to evangelize the world.

10. One task alone remains — the pleasant task of thanking those friends to whose ready aid and sympathy I owe so much, and who have surrounded with happy memories and obligations the completion of my work. First and foremost, my heartiest and sincerest thanks are due to my friends,

a common currency, like Mishna, Gemara, Talmud, etc., I have left the words in the shape most usually adopted. Besides these sources of difference there may doubtless be others "quas aut incuria fudit aut humana parum cavit natura." For these errors, where they occur, as well as for all others, I must ask the indulgence of the candid reader, who will appreciate the difficulties of a task accomplished under conditions far from favorable.

Mr. C. J. Monro, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Mr. R. Garnett, of the British Museum. They have given me an amount of time and attention which leaves me most largely indebted to their unselfish generosity; and I have made claims on their indulgence more extensive than I can adequately repay. To my old pupil, Mr. H. J. Boyd, late scholar of Brasenose College, Oxford, I am indebted for the table of Contents. I have also to thank the Rev. Professor Plumptre and Mr. George Grove not only for the warm interest which they have taken in my work, but also for some valuable suggestions. There are many others, not here named, who will believe without any assurance from me, that I am not ungrateful for the help which they have rendered; and I must especially offer my best acknowledgments to the Rev. T. Teignmouth Shore — but for whose kind encouragement the book would not have been undertaken — and to those who with so much care and patience have conducted it through the press.

And now I send these pages forth not knowing what shall befall them, but with the earnest prayer that they may be blessed to aid the cause of truth and righteousness, and that He in whose name they are written may, of His mercy,

"Forgive them where they fail in truth,
And in his wisdom make me wise."

F. W. F.

The Lodge, Marlborough College,
Monday before Easter, 1874.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Nativity	21
II.	The Presentation in the Temple	33
III.	The Visit of the Magi	38
IV.	The Flight into Egypt, and Massacre of the Innocents	47
V.	The Boyhood of Jesus	57
VI.	Jesus in the Temple	67
VII.	The Home at Nazareth	76
VIII.	The Baptism of John	93
IX.	The Temptation	103
X.	The First Apostles	118
XI.	The First Miracle	132
XII.	The Scene of the Ministry	141
XIII.	Jesus at the Passover	148
XIV.	Nicodemus	157
XV.	The Woman of Samaria	163
XVI.	Rejected by the Nazarenes	171
XVII.	The Beginning of the Galilæan Ministry	181
XVIII.	The Twelve, and the Sermon on the Mount	194
XIX.	Further Miracles	211
XX.	Jesus at Nain	219
XXI.	The Sinner and the Pharisee	228
XXII.	Jesus as He lived in Galilee	236
XXIII.	A Great Day in the Life of Jesus	246
XXIV.	The Day of Matthew's Feast	262
XXV.	The Day of Matthew's Feast (*continued*)	268
XXVI.	A Visit to Jerusalem	274
XXVII.	The Miracle at Bethesda	282

CHAPTER		PAGE
XXVIII.	The Murder of John the Baptist	291
XXIX.	The Feeding of the Five Thousand, and Walking on the Sea	301
XXX.	The Discourse at Capernaum	310
XXXI.	Gathering Opposition	318
XXXII.	Deepening Opposition	339
XXXIII.	The Day of Conflict	348
XXXIV.	Among the Heathen	355
XXXV.	The Great Confession	361
XXXVI.	The Transfiguration	377
XXXVII.	The Demoniac Boy	383
XXXVIII.	A Brief Rest in Capernaum	389
XXXIX.	Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles	394
XL.	The Woman taken in Adultery	404
XLI.	The Man born Blind	417
XLII.	Farewell to Galilee	423
XLIII.	Incidents of the Journey	435
XLIV.	Teachings of the Journey	441
XLV.	The Feast of Dedication	460
XLVI.	The Last Stay in Peræa	467
XLVII.	The Raising of Lazarus	478
XLVIII.	Jericho and Bethany	487
XLIX.	Palm Sunday	500
L.	Monday in Passion Week.—A Day of Parables	512
LI.	The Day of Temptations.—The Last and Greatest Day of the Public Ministry of Jesus	522
LII.	The Great Denunciation	531
LIII.	Farewell to the Temple	541
LIV.	The Beginning of the End	552
LV.	The Last Supper	559
LVI.	The Last Discourse	571
LVII.	Gethsemane.—The Agony and the Arrest,	580
LVIII.	Jesus before the Priests and the Sanhedrin	595

CHAPTER		PAGE
LIX.	The Interval between the Trials	608
LX.	Jesus before Pilate	619
LXI.	The Crucifixion	642
LXII.	The Resurrection	666

APPENDIX.

EXCURSUS		PAGE
I.	The Date of Christ's Birth	683
II.	Christ and the Christians in the Talmud	685
III.	Jesus and Hillel	686
IV.	Greek Learning	691
V.	The Talmud and the Oral Law	692
VI.	Traditional Description of the Appearance of Our Lord	694
VII.	Jewish Angelology and Demonology	695
VIII.	The Unnamed Feast of John v. 1, and the Length of the Ministry	696
IX.	Hypocrisy of the Pharisees	699
X.	Was the Last Supper an Actual Passover?	702
XI.	Old Testament Quotations	708
XII.	Notes on the Talmud	709
XIII.	The Sanhedrin	714
XIV.	Pharisees and Sadducees	716
XV.	Traditional Sayings of Christ	720

THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATIVITY.

Αὐτὸς ἐνήνθρώπησεν να ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν.—ATHAN., *De Incarn.*, p. 54 (*Opp.* i 108).

ONE mile from Bethlehem is a little plain, in which, under a grove of olives, stands the bare and neglected chapel known by the name of "the Angel to the Shepherds."[1] It is built over the traditional site of the fields where, in the beautiful language of St. Luke — more exquisite than any idyl to Christian ears — "there were shepherds keeping watch over their flock by night, when, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord[2] shone round about them," and to their happy ears were uttered the good tidings of great joy, that unto them was born that day in the city of David a Saviour, which was Christ the Lord.

The associations of our Lord's nativity were all of the humblest character, and the very scenery of His birthplace was connected with memories of poverty and toil. On that night, indeed, it seemed as though the heavens must burst to disclose their radiant minstrelsies; and the stars, and the feeding sheep, and the "light and sound in the darkness and stillness," and the rapture of faithful hearts, combine to furnish us with a picture painted in the colors of heaven. But in the brief and thrilling verses of the Evangelist we are not

[1] "*Angelus ad Pastores.*" Near this spot once stood a tower called Migdal Eder, or "Tower of the Flock" (Gen. xxxv. 21). The present rude chapel is, perhaps, a mere fragment of a church built over the spot by Helena. (See Caspari, *Chronologisch-Geographische Einleitung*, p. 57.) The prophet Micah (iv. 8; v. 2) had looked to Migdal Eder with Messianic hopes; and St. Jerome (*De Loc. Hebr.*), writing with views of prophecy which were more current in the ancient than in the modern Church, ventures to say "that by its very name it fore-signified by a sort of prophecy the shepherds at the birth of the Lord."

[2] By δόξα Κυρίου (Luke ii. 9) is probably meant the Shechînah or cloud of brightness which symbolized the Divine presence.

told that those angel songs were heard by any except the wakeful shepherds of an obscure village; — and those shepherds, amid the chill dews of a winter night, were guarding their flocks from the wolf and the robber, in fields where Ruth, their Saviour's ancestress, had gleaned, sick at heart, amid the alien corn, and David, the despised and youngest son of a numerous family, had followed the ewes great with young.[1]

"And suddenly," adds the sole Evangelist who has narrated the circumstances of that memorable night in which Jesus was born, amid the indifference of a world unconscious of its Deliverer, "there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of good will."[2]

It might have been expected that Christian piety would have marked the spot by splendid memorials, and enshrined the rude grotto of the shepherds in the marbles and mosaics of some stately church. But, instead of this, the Chapel of the Herald Angel is a mere rude crypt; and as the traveller descends down the broken steps, which lead from the olive-grove into its dim recess, he can hardly persuade himself that he is in a consecrated place. Yet a half-unconscious sense of fitness has, perhaps, contributed to this apparent neglect. The poverty of the chapel harmonizes well with

[1] Ps. lxxviii. 71.

[2] Luke ii. 14, *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας*: such is the reading of the best MSS., ℵ, A, B, D, and some of the best versions, the Vetus Itala, Vulgate, Gothic, etc. Moreover, however dear the other reading may be to us from long and delightful association, this best maintains the obvious poetic parallelism:

Glory to God in the highest,
Peace to men of good will on earth.

By *ἀνθρωποις εὐδοκίας* we may perhaps understand with Valcknaer, "men with whom God is pleased." As I shall not unfrequently refer to the text of the Greek Testament, I may take this opportunity of telling the ordinary reader that by ℵ is meant the *Codex Sinaiticus*, now at St. Petersburg, discovered by Tischendorf in 1844, and perhaps as old as the fourth century; by A, the *Codex Alexandrinus* in the British Museum, written in the middle of the fifth century: by B, the *Codex Vaticanus* in the Vatican, which belongs to the middle of the fourth century; by C, the *Codex Ephraemi*, a palimpsest in the Imperial Library at Paris, not later than the fifth century; by D, the *Codex Bezae* in the University Library at Cambridge, not later than the seventh century; by E, the *Codex Basiliensis*, about the eighth century; by F, the *Codex Boreeli* at Utrecht; by L, the *Codex Regius Parisiensis*, an accurate and important MS. of the eighth century. I shall seldom refer to the readings of any later MSS. A full and convenient account of them may be found in the Rev. F. Scrivener's *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (1861), and in the Prolegomena to Alford's *Greek Testament*, i. pp. 83–90.

ENVIRONS OF BETHLEHEM

the humble toil of those whose radiant vision it is intended to commemorate.

"Come now! let us go unto Bethlehem,[1] and see this thing which has come to pass, which the Lord made known to us," said the shepherds, when those angel songs had ceased to break the starry silence. Their way would lead them up the terraced hill, and through the moonlit gardens of Bethlehem, until they reached the summit of the gray ridge on which the little town is built. On that summit stood the village inn. The khan (or caravanserai) of a Syrian village, at that day, was probably identical, in its appearance and accommodation, with those which still exist in modern Palestine. A khan is a low structure, built of rough stones, and generally only a single story in height. It consists for the most part of a square enclosure, in which the cattle can be tied up in safety for the night, and an arched recess for the accommodation of travellers. The *leewan*, or paved floor of the recess, is raised a foot or two above the level of the court-yard. A large khan — such, for instance, as that of which the ruins may still be seen at Khan Minyeh, on the shore of the Sea of Galilee — might contain a series of such recesses, which are, in fact, low small rooms with no front wall to them. They are, of course, perfectly public; everything that takes place in them is visible to every person in the khan. They are also totally devoid of even the most ordinary furniture. The traveller may bring his own carpet if he likes, may sit cross-legged upon it for his meals, and may lie upon it at night.[2] As a rule, too, he must bring his own food, attend to his own cattle, and draw his own water from the neighboring spring. He would neither expect nor require attendance, and would pay only the merest trifle for the advantage of shelter, safety, and a floor on which to lie. But if he chanced to arrive late, and the *leewans* were all occupied by earlier guests, he would

[1] Luke ii. 15, *διέλθωμεν δή* = *agedum*. I must remark at the outset that in most of my quotations from the Gospels I do not slavishly follow the English version, but translate from the original Greek.

[2] It is common to find two sides of the one room where the native farmer resides with his cattle, and the remainder elevated about two feet higher for the accommodation of the family" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, II., ch. xxxiii.). See, too, Lane's *Modern Egyptians*, i. 18. — *Leewan* is a corruption of *el-cewán*, which signifies any raised place to sit upon. My description is, however, drawn directly from my own experiences, especially one night at a poor and lonely place called Khan Hulda, between Sidon and Beyrout, at which we found ourselves belated. A distinction has been drawn between *κατάλυμα* (Luke ii. 7) and *πανδοκεῖον* (Luke x. 34), but probably the only distinction is that the former was a *free* place of shelter, and had no host.

have no choice but to be content with such accommodation as he could find in the court-yard below, and secure for himself and his family such small amount of cleanliness and decency as are compatible with an unoccupied corner on the filthy area, which must be shared with horses, mules, and camels. The litter, the closeness, the unpleasant smell of the crowded animals, the unwelcome intrusion of the pariah dogs, the necessary society of the very lowest hangers-on of the caravanserai, are adjuncts to such a position which can only be realized by any traveller in the East who happens to have been placed in similar circumstances.

In Palestine it not unfrequently happens that the entire khan, or at any rate the portion of it in which the animals are housed, is one of those innumerable caves which abound in the limestone rocks of its central hills. Such seems to have been the case at the little town of Bethlehem-Ephratah, in the land of Judah. Justin Martyr the Apologist, who, from his birth at Shechem, was familiar with Palestine, and who lived less than a century after the time of our Lord,[1] places the scene of the nativity in a cave. This is, indeed, the ancient and constant tradition both of the Eastern and the Western Churches, and it is one of the few to which, though unrecorded in the Gospel history, we may attach a reasonable probability.[2] Over this cave has risen the Church and Convent of the Nativity, and it was in a cave close beside it that one of the most learned, eloquent, and holy of the Fathers of the Church — that great St. Jerome to whom we owe the received Latin translation of the Bible — spent thirty of his declining years in study, and fast, and prayer.[3]

From their northern home at Nazareth, in the mountains of Zabulon, Joseph, the village carpenter, had made his way along the wintry roads with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child.[4] Fallen as were their fortunes, they were

[1] Justin Martyr was born at Flavia Neapolis, A.D. 103, and died A.D. 166. The date of his First Apology was about A.D. 138. (Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* i. 153, E. Tr.)

[2] It is impossible to stand in the little Chapel of the Nativity, and to look without emotion on the silver star let into the white marble, encircled by its sixteen ever-burning lamps, and surrounded by the inscription, "*Hic de Virgine Maria Jesus Christus natus est.*"

[3] He settled in Bethlehem A.D. 386 and died A.D. 420. His allusions to the sacredness of the spot are very touching, and the most splendid offers of preferment were insufficient to tempt him away from that holy ground (*Ep.* 24 *ad Marcell.*).

[4] It appears to be uncertain whether the journey of Mary with her husband was obligatory or voluntary. From Dion. Hal. iv. 15 (*ed. Sylb.*, p. 221) and Lact. *De mort. persec.* 23, the former seems not unlikely. Women were liable to a capitation tax, if this enrolment (ἀπογραφή) also involved

both of the house and lineage of David, and they were traversing a journey of eighty miles to the village that had been the home of their great ancestor while he was still a ruddy shepherd lad, tending his flocks upon the lonely hills. The object of that toilsome journey, which could not but be disagreeable to the settled habits of Oriental life, was to enroll their names as members of the house of David in a census which had been ordered by the Emperor Augustus. In the political condition of the Roman Empire, of which Judæa then formed a part, a single whisper of the Emperor was sufficiently powerful to secure the execution of his mandates in the remotest corners of the civilized world. Great as are the historic difficulties in which this census is involved, there seem to be good independent grounds for believing that it may have been originally ordered by Sentius Saturninus,[1] that it was *begun* by Publius Sulpicius Quirinus,[2] when he

taxation (ἀποτίμησις). But, apart from any legal necessity, it may easily be imagined that at such a moment Mary would desire not to be left alone. The cruel suspicion of which she had been the subject, and which had almost led to the breaking off of her betrothal (Matt. i. 19), would make her cling all the more to the protection of her husband.

[1] Tert. *Adv. Marc.* v. 19. It has been held impossible that there should have been a census in the kingdom of an independent prince; yet the case of the Clitae ("Clitarum natio, Cappadoci Archelao subjecta, quia *nostrum in modum deferre census, pati tributa* adigebatur," etc., Tac. *Ann.* vi. 41) seems to be closely parallel. That the enrolment should be conducted in the Jewish fashion at the place of family origin, and not in the Roman fashion at the place of residence, may have been a very natural concession to the necessities of Herod's position. It may be perfectly true that this plan would give more trouble; but, in spite of this, it was far less likely to cause offence. Yet although the whole proceeding was probably due to a mere desire on the part of Augustus to make a *breviarium imperii*, or Domesday Book, which should include the *regna* as well as the provinces (Tac. *Ann.* i. 11), it is very doubtful whether it actually did not cause disturbances at this very time (Jos. *Antt.* xvii. 2, § 2), as we know that it did ten years later. How deeply the disgrace of a heathen census was felt is shown by the Targum of Jonathan, Hab. iii. 17, where for "The flock shall be cut off from the folds, and there shall be no herd in the stalls," he has, "The Romans shall be rooted out; they shall collect no more tribute from Jerusalem" (*Kesooma* = census, v. Buxtorf, s.v.; Gfrörer, *Jahrhund. des Heils*, i. 42).

[2] Cyrenius (P. Sulp. Quirinus) was a man of low extraction, at once ambitious and avaricious, but faithful to Augustus (Tac. *Ann.* ii. 30; iii. 22–48). Other passages bearing more or less directly on this famous census are Tac. *Ann.* i. 11; Suet. *Aug.* 28, 101; Dio Cass. liv. 35, etc.; Suidas, s.v. ἀπογραφή. No less than three censuses of Roman citizens are mentioned in the Monumentum Ancyranum; and Strabo (under Tiberius) speaks of them as common. Zumpt has, with incredible industry and research, all but established in this matter the accuracy of St. Luke, by proving the extreme *probability* that Quirinus was *twice* governor of Syria — viz., 750–753 A.U.C., and again 760–765. It was during the *former* period that he completed the first census which had been commenced by Varus (Zumpt, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi; Hist. Chronol. Untersuchungen*, Leipz., 1870). The argument mainly turns on the fact that in A.U.C. 742, Quirinus was

was for the first time legate of Syria, and that it was completed during his second term of office. In deference to Jewish prejudices, any infringement of which was the certain signal for violent tumults and insurrection, it was not carried out in the ordinary Roman manner, at each person's place of residence, but according to Jewish custom, at the town to which their family originally belonged. The Jews still clung to their genealogies and to the memory of long-extinct tribal relations; and though the journey was a weary and distasteful one, the mind of Joseph may well have been consoled by the remembrance of that heroic descent which would now be authoritatively recognized, and by the glow of those Messianic hopes to which the marvellous circumstances of which he was almost the sole depository would give a tenfold intensity.[1]

consul and afterwards (not before A.U.C. 747) proconsul of Africa: yet some time between this year and A.U.C. 753 (in which year he was appointed *rector* to C. Cæsar, the grandson of Augustus) he conquered the Homonadenses in Cilicia (Tac. *Ann.* iii. 48). He must therefore have been at this time *propraetor* of the *imperial* province of Syria, to which Cilicia belonged. The other provinces near Cilicia (Asia, Bithynia, Pontus, Galatia) were senatorial, *i.e. proconsular*, and as a man could not be *proconsul* twice, Quirinus could not have been governor in any of these. It is not possible here to give the ingenious and elaborate arguments by which Zumpt shows that the Homonadenses must at this time have been under the jurisdiction of the Governor of Syria. Further than this, we know that P. Q. Varus was propraetor of Syria between B.C. 6 and B.C. 4 (A.U.C. 748–750), and it is extremely likely that Varus may have been displaced in favor of Quirinus in the later year, because the close friendship of the former with Aachelaus, who resembled him in character, might have done mischief. It may therefore be regarded as all but certain, on independent grounds, that Quirinus was propraetor of Syria between B.C. 4 and B.C. 1. And if such was the case, instead of having been guilty of a flagrant historical error by antedating, by ten years, the propraetorship of Quirinus in Syria, St. Luke has preserved for us the *historical fact* of his having been *twice* propraetor, or, to give the full title, Legatus Augusti pro praetore; a fact which we should have been unable to learn from Josephus or Dio Cassius, whose histories are here imperfect. For the full arguments on this point the reader must, however, consult the exhaustive treatise of A. W. Zumpt. The appeals of Tertullian to census-records of Saturninus, and of Justin Martyr to the tables of Quirinus, as proving the genealogy of our Lord, are (so far as we can attach any importance to them) an additional confirmation of these conclusions, which are not overthrown by Mommsen (*Res Gest. Div. Aug.*, p. 123) and Strauss (*Leben Jesu*, i. 28); see Merivale, *Hist.* iv. 45. Quirinus, not Quirinius, is probably the true form of the name (Orelli ad Tac. *Ann.* ii. 30). For further discussion of the question see Wieseler, *Synops. of the Four Gospels*, E. Tr., pp. 65–106. I may, however, observe in passing that although no error has been proved, and, on the contrary, there is much reason to believe that the reference is perfectly accurate, yet I hold no theory of inspiration which would prevent me from frankly admitting, in such matters as these, any mistake or inaccuracy which could be shown really to exist.

[1] That Joseph alone knew these facts appears from Matt. i. 19, where the best reading seems to be not παραδειγματίσαι, but δειγματίσαι — *i.e.*, not "make her an example," but, as Eusebius points out, "reveal her condition to

Travelling in the East is a very slow and leisurely affair, and was likely to be still more so if, as is probable, the country was at that time agitated by political animosities. Beeroth, which is fifteen miles distant from Bethlehem,[1] or possibly even Jerusalem, which is only six miles off, may have been the resting-place of Mary and Joseph before this last stage of their journey. But the heavy languor, or even the commencing pangs of travail, must necessarily have retarded the progress of the maiden-mother. Others who were travelling on the same errand would easily have passed them on the road, and when, after toiling up the steep hill-side, by David's well, they arrived at the khan — probably the very one which had been known for centuries as the

the world." The ἐνθυμηθέντος of verse 20 means that this intention continued until the explanation had been revealed to him. There is nothing surprising in the fact that the descendant of a royal house should be in a lowly position. Hillel, the great Rabbi, though he, too, was a descendant of David, spent a great part of his life in the deepest poverty as a common workman. The green turban, which marks a descendant of Mahomet, may often be seen in Egypt and Arabia on the head of paupers and beggars. Similar facts exist quite commonly among ourselves; and, ages before this time, we find that the actual *grandson* of the great Lawgiver himself (Judg. xviii. 30, where the true reading is "Moses," not "Manasseh") was an obscure, wandering, semi-idolatrous Levite, content to serve an irregular ephod for a double suit of apparel and ten shekels (*i.e.*, about thirty shillings) a year (Judg. xvii. 10). On the genealogies given in St. Matthew and St. Luke, see the learned and admirable article by the Bishop of Bath and Wells in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, and his more elaborate work on the same subject. Here I need only add that remarkable confirmations of the descent of Jesus from David are found (1) in the story of Domitian and the Desposyni, alluded to *infr.* Chap. IV.; and (2) in a statement by Ulla, a Rabbi, of the third century, that "Jesus was treated exceptionally *because of His royal extraction*" (שאני ישו דקרוב למלכות הוה, *Sanhedrin*, 43 *a*, in non-expurgated editions) (Derenbourg, *L'Hist. de la Palestine*, p. 349). It is now almost certain that the genealogies in both Gospels are genealogies of Joseph, which, if we may rely on early traditions of their consanguinity, *involve* genealogies of Mary also. The Davidic descent of Mary is implied in Acts ii. 30; xiii. 23; Rom. i. 3; Luke i. 32, etc. St. Matthew gives the legal descent of Joseph, through the elder and regal line, as heir to the throne of David; St. Luke gives the natural descent. Thus the real father of Salathiel was heir of the house of Nathan, but the childless Jeconiah (Jer. xxii. 30) was the last lineal representative of the elder kingly line. The omission of some obscure names and the symmetrical arrangement into tesseradecads were common Jewish customs. It is not too much to say that after the labors of Mill (*On the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, pp. 147–217) and Lord A.C. Hervey (*On the Genealogies of Our Lord*, 1853), scarcely a single serious difficulty remains in reconciling the apparent divergences. And thus, in this, as in so many other instances, the very discrepancies which appear to be most irreconcilable, and most fatal to the historic accuracy of the four Evangelists, turn out, on closer and more patient investigation, to be fresh proofs that they are not only entirely independent, but also entirely trustworthy.

[1] St. Matthew calls it Bethlehem of Judæa (ii. 1) to distinguish it from Bethlehem in Zebulun (Josh. xix. 15). It is the Ephrath of Gen. xlviii. 7. Cf. Micah v. 2.

House of Chimham,[1] and if so, covering perhaps the very ground on which, one thousand years before, had stood the hereditary house of Boaz, of Jesse, and of David — every *leewan* was occupied. The enrolment had drawn so many strangers to the little town, that "there was no room for them in the inn." In the rude limestone grotto attached to it as a stable, among the hay and straw spread for the food and rest of the cattle, weary with their day's journey, far from home, in the midst of strangers, in the chilly winter night — in circumstances so devoid of all earthly comfort or splendor that it is impossible to imagine a humbler nativity — Christ was born.[2]

Distant but a few miles, on the plateau of the abrupt and singular hill now called *Jebel Fureidîs*, or "Little Paradise Mountain," towered the palace-fortress of the Great Herod. The magnificent houses of his friends and courtiers crowded around its base. The humble wayfarers, as they passed near it, might have heard the hired and voluptuous minstrelsy with which its feasts were celebrated, or the shouting of the rough mercenaries whose arms enforced obedience to its despotic lord. But the true King of the Jews — the rightful Lord of the Universe — was not to be found in palace or fortress. They who wear soft clothing are in kings' houses. The cattle-stables of the lowly caravanserai were a more fitting birthplace for Him who came to reveal that the soul of the greatest monarch was no dearer or greater in

[1] Or rather "hostel" (גֵּרוּת) Jer. xli. 17; 2 Sam. xix. 37, 38). One tradition says that the khan was on the ruins of a fortress built by David which had gradually fallen to ruin. The suggestion that the House of Chimham was the khan of Bethlehem is made by Mr. W. Hepworth Dixon (*Holy Land*, I., ch. xiii.). He gives a good description of Syrian khans.

[2] That "it was the winter wild," at the end of B.C. 5 or the beginning of B.C. 4 of our Dionysian era, is all but certain; but neither the day nor the month can be fixed (*εἰσὶν δὲ οἱ περιεσγότερον . . . καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν προστιθέντες*; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 21, § 145). That the actual place of Christ's birth was a cave is, as we have seen, a very ancient tradition, and this cave used to be shown as the scene of the event even so early (A.D. 150) as the time of Justin Martyr (*Dial. c Tryph.*, c. 78, 304, *ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινι συνεγγὺς τῆς κώμης*. Cf. Orig. *c. Cels.*, i. 51). There is therefore nothing improbable in the tradition which points out the actual cave as having been the one now covered by the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem. Hadrian is said to have profaned it by establishing there the worship of Adonis. (Sepp, *Leben Jesu*, i. 7.) It is fair, however, to add that the tradition of the cave *may* have arisen from the LXX. rendering of Isa. xxxiii. 16, just as the subsequent words in the LXX., *ἄρτος δοθήσεται αὐτῷ* were fancifully referred to Bethlehem, "the house of bread." There seems to be no proof of the assertion (mentioned by Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.*, p. 441), that the Arabs, when they plundered the church, found that the Grotto of the Nativity Eas an ancient sepulchre. If such had been the case, is it likely that the Empress Helena (A.D. 330) would have built her church there?

God's sight than the soul of his meanest slave; for Him who had not where to lay His head; for Him who, from His cross of shame, was to rule the world.[1]

Guided by the lamp which usually swings from the centre of a rope hung across the entrance of the khan, the shepherds made their way to the inn of Bethlehem, and found Mary, and Joseph, and the Babe lying in the manger. The fancy of poet and painter has revelled in the imaginary glories of the scene. They have sung of the "bright harnessed angels" who hovered there, and of the stars lingering beyond their time to shed their sweet influences upon that smiling infancy. They have painted the radiation of light from His manger-cradle, illuminating all the place till the bystanders are forced to shade their eyes from that heavenly splendor.[2] But all this is wide of the reality. Such glories as the simple shepherds saw were seen only by the eye of faith; and all which met their gaze was a peasant of Galilee, already beyond the prime of life, and a young mother, of whom *they* could not know that she was wedded maid and virgin wife, with an Infant Child, whom since there were none to help her, her own hands had wrapped in swaddling-clothes. The light that shined in the darkness was no physical, but a spiritual beam; the Dayspring from on high, which had now visited mankind, dawned only in a few faithful and humble hearts.[3]

[1] Ps. xcvi. 10, LXX. ἐβασίλευσεν [ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου] (J. Mart., *Dial. c. Tryph.* § 78, p. 298). Tert. *Adv. Marc.* iii. 19, "Age nunc si legisti penes David, '*Dominus regnavit a ligno*,' exspecto quid intelligas nisi forte lignarium aliquem regem Judaeorum et non Christum, qui exinde passione ligni superata morte regnavit." Some suggest that the LXX. read יָעַץ for עָץ, but it is more probable that the words were added by Christians than that they were erased by Jews. The admission of the rendering quoted by Tertullian from the Vetus Itala, made some of the Western fathers attach great importance to a phrase which, though interesting, is certainly spurious.

[2] As in the splendid picture, "La Notte," of Correggio. See Arab. Gospel of the Infancy, ch. iii.: "And lo! it (the cave) was filled with lights more beautiful than the glittering of lamps and candles, and brighter than the light of the sun." Protev. ch. xix.: "There appeared a great light in the cave, so that their eyes could not bear it." Gosp. Pseud. Matth. xiii.: "A cave below a cavern, in which there was never any light, but always darkness. And when the blessed Mary had entered it, it began to become all light with brightness," etc. "Praesepe jam fulget tuum" (Ambros. *De Adv. Dom.* 86). "Quando Christus natus est corpus ejus resplenduit ut sol quando oritur" (Vincent Lerin. *Serm. de Nativitate*, referring to Isa. ix. 2).

[3] The apocryphal Gospels, with their fondness for circumstantiality, and their readiness on all occasions to invent imaginary names, say that there were four shepherds, and that their names were Misael, Acheel, Cyriacus, and Stephanus (see Hofmann, *Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen*, p. 117). The little village of Beit-Sahur is pointed out as their native place.

And the Gospels, always truthful and bearing on every page that simplicity which is the stamp of honest narrative, indicate this fact without comment. There is in them nothing of the exuberance of marvel, and mystery, and miracle which appears alike in the Jewish imaginations about their coming Messiah, and in the apocryphal narratives about the Infant Christ. There is no more decisive criterion of their absolute credibility as simple histories, than the marked and violent contrast which they offer to all the spurious gospels of the early centuries, and all the imaginative legends which have clustered about them. Had our Gospels been unauthentic, they too must inevitably have partaken of the characteristics which mark, without exception, every early fiction about the Saviour's life. To the unilluminated fancy it would have seemed incredible that the most stupendous event in the world's history should have taken place without convulsions and catastrophes. In the Gospel of St. James [1] there is a really striking chapter, describing how, at the awful moment of the nativity, the pole of the heaven stood motionless, and the birds were still, and there were workmen lying on the earth with their hands in a vessel, "and those who handled did not handle it, and those who took did not lift, and those who presented it to their mouth did not present it, but the faces of all were looking up; and I saw the sheep scattered and the sheep stood, and the shepherd lifted up his hand to strike, and his hand remained up; and I looked at the stream of the river, and the mouths of the kids were down, and were not drinking; and everything which was being propelled forward was intercepted in its course." But of this sudden hush and pause of awe-struck Nature,[2] of the parhelions and mysterious splendors which blazed in many parts of the world, of the painless childbirth,[3] of the perpetual virginity,[4] of the ox and the ass kneeling to worship Him in the manger,[5] of the voice with which imme-

[1] Commonly known as the Protevangelium, ch. xviii.

[2] "Credibile est in aliis partibus mundi aliqua indicia nativitatis Christi apparuisse" (S. Thom. Aquin., *Summa* iii., *qu.* 36, art. 3). (Hofmann, p. 155, seqq.)

[3] "Nulla ibi obstetrix, nulla muliercularum sedulitas intercessit" (Jer. *Adv. Helvid.*), probably with reference to Ps. xxii. 9 — "Thou art He who tookest me out of my mother's womb." This is, however, involved in Luke ii. 7, ἐσπαργάνωσεν.

[4] "Virgo ante partum, in partu, post partum" (Aug. *Serm.* 123). "Claustrum pudoris permanet" (Ambros. *De Adv. Dom.* 10). This was a mere fantastic inference from Ezek. xliv. 2. (See Jer. Taylor, *Life of Christ*, ed. Eden, p. 65, *n.*)

[5] Gosp. Pseud. Matth. xiv. An incident imagined with reference to Isa. i. 3, "The ox knoweth his owner," etc., and Hab. iii. 2, mistranslated

diately after His birth He told His mother that He was the Son of God,[1] and of many another wonder which rooted itself in the earliest traditions, there is no trace whatever in the New Testament. The inventions of man differ wholly from the dealings of God. In His designs there is no haste, no rest, no weariness, no discontinuity; all things are done by Him in the majesty of silence, and they are seen under a light that shineth quietly in the darkness, "showing all things in the slow history of their ripening." "The unfathomable depths of the Divine counsels," it has been said, "were moved; the fountains of the great deep were broken up; the healing of the nations was issuing forth: but nothing was seen on the surface of human society but this slight rippling of the water; the course of human things went on as usual, while each was taken up with little projects of his own."

How long the Virgin Mother and her holy Child stayed in this cave, or cattle-enclosure, we cannot tell, but probably it was not for long. The word rendered "manger" in Luke ii. 7,[2] is of very uncertain meaning, nor can we discover more about it than that it means a place where animals were fed.[3] It is probable that the crowd in the khan would not be permanent, and common humanity would have dictated an early removal of the mother and her Child to some more appropriate resting-place. The magi, as we see from St. Matthew, visited Mary in "the house."[4] But on all these minor incidents the Gospels do not dwell. The fullest of them is St. Luke, and the singular sweetness of his narrative, its almost idyllic grace, its sweet, calm tone of noble reticence, seem

in the LXX., "Between two animals Thou shalt be made known" (*ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ*), and the Vet. Itala ("In medio duorum animalium innotescris"). "Cognovit bos et asinus Quod puer erat Dominus" (Pistor, *De Nativ. Dom.* 5).

[1] Arab. Gosp. of Inf. i.

[2] *φάτνη* (from *πατέομαι*, "I eat:" Curtius, *Grundzüge Griech. Etym.*, ii. 84). It is used for אֵבוּס, A. V., "crib," in Prov. xiv. 4 (Targ. אוּרוּתָא, "barn:" cf. Isa. i. 3; Job xxxix. 9), and for אֲרִי, "stable," in 2 Chron. xxxii. 28; cf. Hab. iii. 17. In Luke xiii. 15 it is rendered "stall." But actual mangers, built as they are in the shape of a kneading-trough, may be, and are, used as cradles in the East (Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii. 533). Even where these are wanting, there is often a projecting ledge on which the cattle can rest their nosebags. Mangers are certainly ancient (Hom. *Il.* x. 568; Hdt. ix. 70). On the whole I conclude that *φάτνη* means primarily "an enclosure where cattle are fed;" and secondly, "the place from which they eat," and hence is used both for a stable and a manger.

[3] Vulg. "praesepe." Hence Mr. Grove (*Bibl. Dict.* s.v. "Bethlehem") goes a little too far in saying that "the stable and its accompaniments are the creation of the imagination of poets and painters, with *no support* from the Gospel narrative."

[4] Matt. ii. 11.

clearly to indicate that he derived it, though but in fragmentary notices, from the lips of Mary herself. It is, indeed, difficult to imagine from whom else it could have come, for mothers are the natural historians of infant years; but it is interesting to find, in the actual style, that "coloring of a woman's memory and a woman's view," which we should naturally have expected in confirmation of a conjecture so obvious and so interesting.[1] To one who was giving the reins to his imagination, the minutest incidents would have claimed a description; to Mary they would have seemed trivial and irrelevant. Others might wonder, but in her all wonder was lost in the one overwhelming revelation — the one absorbing consciousness. Of such things she could not lightly speak; "she kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart."[2] The very depth and sacredness of that reticence is the natural and probable explanation of the fact, that some of the details of the Saviour's infancy are fully recorded by St. Luke alone.

[1] See Lange, i. 325. [2] Luke ii. 19.

CHAPTER II.

THE PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE

"He who with all heaven's heraldry whilere
Entered the world, now bleeds to give us ease.
Alas! how soon our sin
Sore doth begin
His infancy to seize!" — MILTON, *The Circumcision.*

FOUR events only of our Lord's infancy are narrated by the Gospels — namely, the Circumcision, the Presentation in the Temple, the Visit of the Magi, and the Flight into Egypt. Of these the first two occur only in St. Luke, the last two only in St. Matthew. Yet no single particular can be pointed out in which the two narratives are necessarily contradictory. If, on other grounds, we have ample reason to accept the evidence of the Evangelists, as evidence given by witnesses of unimpeachable honesty, we have every right to believe that, to whatever cause the confessed fragmentariness of their narratives may be due, those narratives may fairly be regarded as supplementing each other. It is as dishonest to assume the existence of irreconcilable discrepancies, as it is to suggest the adoption of impossible harmonies. The accurate and detailed sequence of biographical narrative from the earliest years of life was a thing wholly unknown to the Jews, and alien alike from their style and temperament. Anecdotes of infancy, incidents of childhood, indications of future greatness in boyish years, are a very rare phenomenon in ancient literature. It is only since the dawn of Christianity that childhood has been surrounded by a halo of romance.

The exact order of the events which occurred before the return to Nazareth can only be a matter of uncertain conjecture. The Circumcision was on the eighth day after the birth (Luke i. 59; ii. 21); the Purification was thirty-three days after the circumcision[1] (Lev. xii. 4); the Visit of the Magi was "when Jesus was born in Bethlehem" (Matt. ii.

[1] Not after the *birth*, as Caspari says.

1); and the Flight into Egypt immediately after their departure. The supposition that the return from Egypt was previous to the Presentation in the Temple, though not absolutely impossible, seems most improbable. To say nothing of the fact that such a postponement would have been a violation (however necessary) of the Levitical law,[1] it would either involve the supposition that the Purification was long postponed, which seems to be contradicted by the twice-repeated expression of St. Luke (ii. 22, 39); or it supposes that forty days allowed sufficient time for the journey of the wise men from "the East," and for the flight to, and return from, Egypt. It involves, moreover, the extreme improbability of a return of the Holy Family to Jerusalem — a town but six miles distant from Bethlehem — within a few days after an event so frightful as the Massacre of the Innocents. Although no supposition is entirely free from the objections which necessarily arise out of our ignorance of the circumstances, it seems almost certain that the Flight into Egypt, and the circumstances which led to it, did not occur till after the Presentation. For forty days, therefore, the Holy Family were left in peace and obscurity, in a spot surrounded by so many scenes of interest, and hallowed by so many traditions of their family and race.

Of the Circumcision no mention is made by the Apocryphal Gospels, except an amazingly repulsive one in the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy.[2] It was not an incident which would be likely to interest those whose object it was to intrude their own dogmatic fancies into the sacred story. But to the Christian it has its own solemn meaning. It shows that Christ came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil. Thus it became Him to fulfil all righteousness.[3] Thus early did He suffer pain for our sakes, to teach us the spiritual circumcision — the circumcision of the heart — the circumcision of all our bodily senses.[4] As the East catches at sun-

[1] For by the law a woman was obliged to stay in the house during the forty days before the purification (Lev. xii. 1–8).

[2] Arab. Ev. Inf. ch. v. — It was doubtless performed by Joseph, and the presence of witnesses was necessary. Special prayers were offered on the occasion, a chair was placed for the prophet Elijah, as the precursor of the Messiah, and a feast terminated the ceremony. Lange (i. 399) well observes the contrast between the slight notice of the circumcision of Jesus, and the great festivities with which that of St. John was solemnized. "In John the rite of circumcision solemnized its last glory."

[3] Matt. iii. 15.

[4] See the somewhat fanciful, yet beautiful remarks of St. Bonaventura in his *Vita Christi*, ch. v.: "We Christians have baptism, a rite of fuller grace, and free from pain. Nevertheless, we ought to practise the circumcision of the heart."

set the colors of the west, so Bethlehem is a prelude to Calvary, and even the infant's cradle is tinged with a crimson reflection from the Redeemer's cross.[1] It was on this day, too, that Christ first publicly received that name[2] of Jesus, which the command of the angel Gabriel had already announced. "Hoshea" meant salvation; Joshua, "whose salvation is Jehovah;"[3] Jesus is but the English modification of the Greek form of the name. At this time it was a name extraordinarily common among the Jews. It was dear to them as having been borne by the great Leader who had conducted them into victorious possession of the Promised Land, and by the great High Priest who had headed the band of exiles who returned from Babylon;[4] but henceforth — not for Jews only, but for all the world — it was destined to acquire a significance infinitely more sacred as the mortal designation of the Son of God. The Hebrew "Messiah" and the Greek "Christ" were names which represented His office as the Anointed Prophet, Priest, and King; but "Jesus" was the personal name which He bore as one who "emptied Himself of His glory" to become a sinless man among sinful men.[5]

On the fortieth day after the nativity — until which time she could not leave the house — the Virgin presented herself with her Babe for their Purification in the Temple at Jerusa-

[1] See Williams, *Nativity*, p. 87.

[2] Among the Greeks, and Romans also, the *γενέθλια*, or nominalia, were on the eighth or ninth day after birth. Among the Jews this was due to the fact mentioned in Gen. xvii. 5, 15 (Abraham and Sarah).

[3] יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, יֵשׁוּעַ, and יֵשׁוּ (Jehoshua, Jeshua, Jeshu) are the forms in which it occurs. It was sometimes Grecized into Jason, sometimes into Jesus. Its meaning is given in Philo) *σωτηρία Κυρίου*, (*De Mutat. Nomin.*, § 21), and in Ecclus. xlvi. 1 (*μεγας ἐπὶ σωτηρία*), just as in Matt. i. 21. In the New Testament "Jesus" twice stands for Jeshua (Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8). The name thus resembles the German *Gotthilf*. The Valentinians, by the cabalistic system, *notarikon*, made it equivalent to Jehovah shammaim va-aretz (see *Iren.* II., xxxiv. 4); and Osiander makes it the ineffable name, the "Shemhammephorash," rendered utterable by an inserted יִ.

[4] See Ezra ii. 2; iii. 2; Zech. iii. 1, etc. For other bearers of the name, see 1 Chron. xxiv. 11; 1 Sam. vi. 14; 2 Kings xxiii. 8; Luke iii. 29. A son of Saul is said to have been so called (Jos. *Antt.* vi. 6, § 6). In the New Testament we have "Jesus which is called Justus" (Col. iv. 11); Bar-Jesus (Acts xiii. 6); and probably *Jesus* Barabbas, if the reading be right in Matt. xxvii. 16. Possibly the name might have been omitted by transcribers from feelings of reverence; on the other hand, it might have been inserted by heretics to spoil the fancy (alluded to by Origen *ad loc.*) that "in tantâ multitudine Scripturarum *neminem invenimus Jesum peccatorem.*" (See Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 384–387.) No less than twelve people of the name (besides those mentioned in Scripture) are alluded to in Josephus alone.

[5] "Jesus mel in ore, in aure melos, in corde jubilum." (St. Bern.)

lem.[1] "Thus, then," says St. Bonaventura, "do they bring the Lord of the Temple to the Temple of the Lord." The proper offering on such occasions was a yearling lamb for a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or turtle-dove for a sin-offering;[2] but with that beautiful tenderness, which is so marked a characteristic of the Mosaic legislation, those who were too poor for so comparatively costly an offering, were allowed to bring instead two turtle-doves or two young pigeons.[3] With this humble offering Mary presented herself to the priest. At the same time Jesus, as being a first-born son, was presented to God, and in accordance with the law, was redeemed from the necessity of Temple service by the ordinary payment of five shekels of the sanctuary (Numb. xviii. 15, 16), amounting in value to about fifteen shillings. Of the purification and presentation no further details are given to us, but this visit to the Temple was rendered memorable by a double incident — the recognition of the Infant Saviour by Simeon and Anna.

Of Simeon we are simply told that he was a just and devout Israelite endowed with the gift of prophecy, and that having received divine intimation that his death would not take place till he had seen the Messiah,[4] he entered under some inspired impulse into the Temple, and there, recognizing the Holy Child, took Him in his arms, and burst into that glorious song — the "Nunc Dimittis" — which for eighteen centuries has been so dear to Christian hearts. The prophecy that the Babe should be "a light to lighten the *Gentiles*," no less than the strangeness of the circumstances, may well have caused astonishment to His parents, from whom the aged prophet did not conceal their own future sorrows — warning the Virgin Mother especially, both of the deadly opposition which that Divine Child was destined to encounter, and of the national perils which should agitate the days to come.[5]

[1] τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ. The reading, αὐτῆς, adopted by the E. V., is of very inferior authority, and probably due to dogmatic prejudice. Αὐτοῦ, the reading of the Codex Bezae, is singular, but improbable.

[2] Luke ii. 22; Lev. xii. 1–8; Numb. xviii. 16.

[3] Lev. xii. 6–8.

[4] Hence he has received in early Christian writers the surname of Θεοδόκος. The expression, "waiting for the consolation of Israel," resembles what St. Mark says of Joseph of Arimathea, "who also waited for the kingdom of God" (Mark xv. 43). A prayer for the coming of the Messiah formed a part of the daily *ge'ullah;* and "may I see the consolation of Israel," was a common formula of hope. Sepp quotes *Chagiyah*, fol. 16, and other rabbinical authorities.

[5] The word κεῖται (Luke ii. 34) has been taken to mean, "this child who lies in my arms;" but the E. V. is probably nearer to the true meaning, and the metaphor involved is that of a stone — whether for stumbling or

Legend has been busy with the name of Simeon. In the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, he recognizes Jesus because he sees Him shining like a pillar of light in His mother's arms.[1] Nicephorus tells us that, in reading the Scriptures, he had stumbled at the verse, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son" (Isa. vii. 14), and had then received the intimation that he should not die till he had seen it fulfilled. All attempts to identify him with other Simeons have failed.[2] Had he been a High Priest, or President of the Sanhedrin, St. Luke could not have introduced him so casually as a "man (ἄνθρωπος) in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon." The statement in the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary that he was 113 years old is wholly arbitrary; as is the conjecture that the silence of the Talmud about him is due to his Christian proclivities. He could not have been Rabban Simeon, the son of Hillel, and father of Gamaliel, who would not at this time have been so old. Still less could he have been the far earlier Simeon the Just, who was believed to have prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem, and who was the last survivor of the great Sanhedrin.[3] It is curious that we should be told nothing respecting him, while of Anna the prophetess several interesting particulars are given, and among others that she was of the tribe of Asher — a valuable proof that tribal relations still lived affectionately in the memory of the people.[4]

for edification (v. Wordsworth *ad loc.*). In the sad prophecy, "Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also," the same word, ῥομφαία is used as in Zech. xiii. 7, LXX.

[1] Ev. Inf. Arab. ch. vi.

[2] Gospel of James xxvi. and of Nicodemus xvi. They call him ὁ μέγας διδάσκαλος. It is a curious coincidence that the Jews say that "Christ was born in the days of R. Simeon, the son of Hillel."

[3] I spell this word, Sanhedrin throughout, because it is evidently a mere transliteration of the Greek συνέδριον.

[4] I can see no ground for the conjecture of Schleiermacher, approved by Neander, that the narrative was derived from Anna herself.

CHAPTER III.

THE VISIT OF THE MAGI.

"O Jerusalem, look about thee toward the east and behold the joy that cometh unto thee from God." — BARUCH iv. 36.

THE brief narrative of the Visit of the Magi, recorded in the second chapter of St. Matthew, is of the deepest interest in the history of Christianity. It is, in the first place, the Epiphany, or Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles. It brings the facts of the Gospel history into close connection with Jewish belief, with ancient prophecy, with secular history, and with modern science; and in doing so it furnishes us with new confirmations of our faith, derived incidentally, and therefore in the most unsuspicious manner, from indisputable and unexpected quarters.

Herod the Great, who, after a life of splendid misery and criminal success, had now sunk into the jealous decrepitude of his savage old age, was residing in his new palace on Zion, when, half maddened as he was already by the crimes of his past career, he was thrown into a fresh paroxysm of alarm and anxiety by the visit of some Eastern Magi, bearing the strange intelligence that they had seen in the East[1] the star of a new-born king of the Jews, and had come to worship him. Herod, a mere Idumæan usurper, a more than suspected apostate, the detested tyrant over an unwilling people, the sacrilegious plunderer of the tomb of David[2] —

[1] The expression might, perhaps, be rendered, "at its rising" (the plural *ἀνατολαί*, not *ἀνατολή* is used for "the east," in Matt. ii. 1); but this would seem to require *αὐτοῦ*, and does not well suit verse 9.

[2] Jos. *Antt.* xvi. 7, § 1. On seizing the throne, with the support of the Romans, and specially of Antony, more than thirty years before (A.U.C. 717), Herod (whose mother, Cypros, was an Arabian, and his father, Antipater, an Idumæan) had been distinctly informed by the Sanhedrin that, in obedience to Deut. xvii. 15, they could not accept a stranger for their king. This faithfulness cost a great many of them their lives. (See Jos. *Antt.* xiv. 9, § 4; xv. 1, etc. and rabbinic authorities quoted by Sepp.) The political and personal relations of Herod were evidently well adapted for the furtherance of a new religion. The rulers of the Jews, since the Captivity, had been Persian between B.C. 536–332; Egypto-Greek and Syro-Greek between B.C. 332–142; Asmonæan and independent between B.C.

Herod, a descendant of the despised Ishmael and the hated Esau, heard the tidings with a terror and indignation which it was hard to dissimulate. The grandson of one who, as was believed, had been a mere servitor in a temple at Ascalon, and who in his youth had been carried off by Edomite brigands, he well knew how worthless were his pretensions to an historic throne which he held solely by successful adventure. But his craft equalled his cruelty, and finding that all Jerusalem shared his suspense, he summoned to his palace the leading priests and theologians of the Jews — perhaps the relics of that Sanhedrin which he had long reduced to a despicable shadow — to inquire of them where the Messiah[1] was to be born. He received the ready and confident answer that Bethlehem was the town indicated for that honor by the prophecy of Micah.[2] Concealing, therefore, his desperate intention, he despatched the wise men to Bethlehem, bidding them to let him know as soon as they had found the child, that he too might come and do him reverence.

Before continuing the narrative, let us pause to inquire who these Eastern wanderers were, and what can be discovered respecting their mysterious mission.

The name "Magi," by which they are called in the Greek of St. Matthew, is perfectly vague. It meant originally a

142–63; and under Roman influences since the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, B.C. 63. Under Herod (from B.C. 37 to the birth of Christ) the government might fairly be called cosmopolitan. In him the East and West were united. By birth an Edomite on the father's side, and an Ishmaelite on the mother's, he represented a *third* great division of the Semitic race by his nominal adoption of the Jewish religion. Yet his life was entirely moulded by conceptions borrowed from the two great *Aryan* races of the ancient world; his conceptions of policy and government were entirely Roman; his ideal of life and enjoyment entirely Greek. And in addition to this, he was surrounded by a body-guard of barbarian mercenaries. At no previous or subsequent period could a world-religion have been more easily preached than it was among the heterogeneous elements which were brought together by his singular tyranny. (Guder, *König Herodes der Grosse*, i.) His astuteness, however, had early taught him that his one best security was to truckle to the all-powerful Romans (*οἱ πάντων κρατοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι*, Jos. *Antt.* xv. 11, § 1).

[1] Not as in the English version, "where *Christ* should be born;" for it is *ὁ Χριστὸς*, "the Anointed." "Christ" in the Gospels, even when without the article in Greek, which is only in four passages, is *almost* without exception (John xvii. 3) an appellative and not a proper name ("non proprium nomen est, sed nuncupatio potestatis et regni," Lact, *Instt. Div.* iv. 7). (See Lightfoot *on Revision*, 100.)

[2] Micah v. 2; cf. John vii. 42. The latter passage shows how familiarly this prophecy was known to the people. The Jewish authorities quote the text loosely, but give the sense. (See Turpie, *The Old Test. in the New*, p. 189.) The version of Gen. xlix. 27 in the Targum of Onkelos is, "The Shechînah shall dwell in the land of Benjamin." (Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 55.)

sect of Median and Persian scholars; it was subsequently applied[1] (as in Acts xiii. 6) to pretended astrologers or Oriental soothsayers. Such characters were well known to antiquity, under the name of Chaldæans, and their visits were by no means unfamiliar even to the Western nations. Diogenes Laertius reports to us a story of Aristotle, that a Syrian *mage* had predicted to Socrates that he would die a violent death;[1] and Seneca informs us that magi "*qui forte Athenis erant*," had visited the tomb of Plato, and had there offered incense to him as a divine being.[2] There is nothing but a mass of confused and contradictory tradition to throw any light either on their rank, their country, their number, or their names. The tradition which makes them kings was probably founded on the prophecy of Isaiah (lx. 3): "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising." The fancy that they were Arabians may have arisen from the fact that myrrh and frankincense are Arabian products, joined to the passage in Ps. lxxii. 10, "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall give presents; the kings of Arabia and Saba shall bring gifts."[3]

There was a double tradition as to their number. Augustine and Chrysostom say that there were twelve, but the common belief, arising perhaps from the triple gifts, is that they were three in number.[4] The Venerable Bede even gives us their names, their country, and their personal appearance. Melchior was an old man with white hair and long beard; Caspar, a ruddy and beardless youth; Balthasar, swarthy and in the prime of life.[5] We are further informed by tradition that Melchior was a descendant of Shem, Caspar of Ham, and Balthasar of Japheth. Thus they are made representatives of the three periods of life, and the three divisions of the globe; and valueless as such fictions may be for direct historical purposes, they have been rendered interesting by their influence on the most splendid productions of religious art.[6] The skulls of these three kings, each circled with its

[1] Diog. Laert. ii. 45.

[2] Sen. *Ep.* 58.

[3] In the original, עֲרָבָא, *i.e.* Arabia Felix. One MS. of the Protevangelium makes them come from Persia (ἐκ Περσίδος); Theodoret calls them Chaldæans; Hilary, Æthiopians; some more recent writers make them Indians. (See Hofmann, p. 127.)

[4] See all the authorities for these legends or fancies quoted with immense learning and accuracy by Hofmann.

[5] Bede, *Opp.* iii. 649.

[6] The art student will at once recall the glorious pictures of Paul Veronese, Giovanni Bellini, etc.

crown of jewelled gold, are still exhibited among the relics in the cathedral at Cologne.[1]

It is, however, more immediately to our purpose to ascertain the causes of their memorable journey.

We are informed by Tacitus, by Suetonius, and by Josephus,[2] that there prevailed throughout the entire East at this time an intense conviction, derived from ancient prophecies, that ere long a powerful monarch would arise in Judæa, and gain dominion over the world. It has, indeed, been conjectured that the Roman historians may simply be echoing an assertion, for which Josephus was in reality their sole authority; but even if we accept this uncertain supposition, there is still ample proof, both in Jewish and in Pagan writings, that a guilty and weary world was dimly expecting the advent of its Deliverer. "The dew of blessing falls not on us, and our fruits have no taste," exclaimed Rabban Simeon, the son of Gamaliel; and the expression might sum up much of the literature of an age which was, as Niebuhr says, "effete with the drunkenness of crime." The splendid vaticination in the fourth Eclogue of Virgil proves the intensity of the feeling, and has long been reckoned among the "unconscious prophecies of heathendom."

There is, therefore, nothing extraordinary in the fact that these Eastern magi should have bent their steps to Jerusalem, especially if there were any circumstances to awaken in the East a more immediate conviction that this widespread expectation was on the point of fulfilment. If they were disciples of Zoroaster, they would see in the Infant King the future conqueror of Ahriman, the destined Lord of all the World. The story of their journey has indeed been set down with contemptuous confidence as a mere poetic myth; but though its actual historic verity must rest on the testimony of the Evangelist alone, there are many facts which enable us to see that in its main outlines it involves nothing either impossible or even improbable.

[1] They were said to have been found by Bishop Reinald in the twelfth century.

[2] Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum libris contineri, fore ut valesceret oriens, et e Judaea profecti rerum potirentur" (Tac. *Hist.* v. 13). "Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judaea profecti rerum potirentur" (Suet. *Vesp.* 4). *χρησμὸς . . . ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τις αὐτῶν ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης* Jos. *B. J.* vi. 5, § 4) Josephus steadily and characteristically interprets the prophecy of Vespasian. It is true that these historians refer to the days of the Flavian dynasty (A.D. 79); but the "vetus" of Suetonius, and the 4th Eclogue of Virgil, taken in connection with the possible date of the Third Book of the Sibylline Oracles, are signs that the expectation had existed half a century earlier.

Now St. Matthew tells us that the cause of their expectant attitude was that they had seen the star of the Messiah in the East and that to discover Him was the motive of their journey.

That any strange sidereal phenomenon should be interpreted as the signal of a coming king, was in strict accordance with the belief of their age. Such a notion may well have arisen from the prophecy of Balaam,[1] the Gentile sorcerer — a prophecy which from the power of its rhythm, and the splendor of its imagery, could hardly fail to be disseminated in eastern countries. Nearly a century afterwards, the false Messiah, in the reign of Hadrian, received from the celebrated Rabbi Akiba, the surname of Bar-Cocheba, or "Son of a Star," and caused a star to be stamped upon the coinage which he issued. Six centuries afterwards, Mahomet is said to have pointed to a comet as a portent illustrative of his pretensions. Even the Greeks and Romans[2] had always considered that the births and deaths of great men were symbolized by the appearance and disappearance of heavenly bodies, and the same belief has continued down to comparatively modern times. The evanescent star which appeared in the time of Tycho Brahe, and was noticed by him on Nov. 11, 1572, was believed to indicate the brief but dazzling career of some warrior from the north, and was subsequently regarded as having been prophetic of the fortunes of Gustavus Adolphus. Now it so happens that, although the exact year in which Christ was born is not ascertainable with any certainty from Scripture, yet, within a few years of what must, on any calculation, have been the period of His birth, there *undoubtedly* did appear a phenomenon in the heavens so remarkable that it could not possibly have escaped the observation of an astrological people. The immediate applicability of this phenomenon to the Gospel narrative is now generally abandoned;

[1] That the Jews and their Rabbis had borrowed many astrological notions from the Chaldæans, and that they connected these notions with the advent of the Messiah, is certain. See the quotations from the tract *Sanhedrin*, R. Abraham, Abarbanel, the *Zohar*, in Münter, Sepp, etc. Comp. Jos. *Antt.* ii. 9, § 2, and i. 7, § 2, where Josephus quotes Berosus as having said that Abram was "skilful in the celestial science."

[2] Luc. i. 529: Suet. *Caes.* 88; Sen. *Nat. Quaest.* i. 1; Serv. ad Virg. *Ecl.* 9, 47, "Ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum," etc. — Every one will remember the allusions in Shakespeare —

"The Heavens themselves blaze at the death of princes." — *Henry IV.*

and

"Comets portending change of time and state,
Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky,
And with them scourge the bad revolting stars
That have consented to our Henry's death."—1 *Henry VI.*, i. 1.

but, whatever other theory may be held about it, it is unquestionably important and interesting as having furnished one of the data which first led to the discovery, that the birth of Christ took place three or four years before our received era.[1] This appearance, and the circumstances which have been brought into connection with it, we will proceed to notice. They form a curious episode in the history of exegesis, and are otherwise remarkable; but we must fully warn the reader that the evidence by which this astronomical fact has been brought into immediate connection with St. Matthew's narrative is purely conjectural, and must be received, if received at all, with considerable caution.

On Dec. 17, 1603, there occurred a conjunction of the two largest superior planets, Saturn and Jupiter, in the zodiacal sign of the Fishes, in the watery trigon.[2] In the following spring they were joined in the fiery trigon by Mars, and in Sept., 1604, there appeared in the foot of Ophiuchus' and between Mars and Saturn, a new star of the first magnitude, which, after shining for a whole year, gradually waned in March, 1606, and finally disappeared.[3] Brunowski, the pupil of Kepler, who first noticed it, describes it as sparkling with an interchange of colors like a diamond, and as not being in any way nebulous, or offering any analogy to a comet.[4] These remarkable phenomena attracted the attention of the great Kepler, who, from his acquaintance with astrology, knew the immense importance which such a conjunction would have had in the eyes of the Magi, and wished to discover whether any such conjunction had taken place about the period of our Lord's birth. Now there is a conjunction of Jupiter and

[1] This is the date adopted by Ideler, Sanclemente, Wieseler. Herod the Great died in the first week of Nisan, A.U.C. 750, as we can prove, partly from the fact that shortly before his death there was an eclipse of the moon (Jos. *Antt.* xvii. 6, § 4). Ideler and Wurm have shown that the only eclipse visible at Jerusalem in the year 750 A.U.C., B.C. 4, must have taken place in the night between the 12th and 13th of March (Wieseler, p. 56). Our era was invented by Dionysius Exiguus, an abbot at Rome, who died in 556. See Appendix, Excursus I., "Date of Christ's Birth."

[2] Astrologers divided the Zodiac into four trigons — that of fire (Aries, Leo, Sagittarius); that of earth (Taurus, Virgo, Capricornus); that of air (Gemini, Libra, Aquarius); and that of water (Cancer, Scorpio, Pisces). (Wieseler, *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, E. Tr., p. 57.) — On the astrology of the Jews in general, see Gfrörer, *Jahrh. des Heils*, ii. 116.

[3] The star observed by Tycho lasted from November, 1572, till about April, 1574. Such temporary stars are perhaps due to immense combustions of hydrogen. See Guillemin, *The Heavens*, pp. 310–313; Humboldt's *Cosmos*, ii. 323–333 (ed. Sabine).

[4] There may, therefore, be no exaggeration in the language of Ignatius (*Ep. ad Ephes.* § 19), when he says, "The star sparkled brilliantly above all stars."

Saturn in the same trigon about every twenty years, but in every 200 years they pass into another trigon, and are not conjoined in the same trigon again (after passing through the entire Zodiac), till after a lapse of 794 years four months and twelve days. By calculating backwards, Kepler discovered that the same conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, in Pisces, had happened no less than three times in the year A.U.C. 747, and that the planet Mars had joined them in the spring of 748; and the general fact that there was such a combination at this period has been verified by a number of independent investigators,[1] and does not seem to admit of denial. And however we may apply the fact, it is certainly an interesting one. For such a conjunction would at once have been interpreted by the Chaldæan observers as indicating the approach of some memorable event; and since it occurred in the constellation Pisces, which was supposed by astrologers to be immediately connected with the fortunes of Judæa,[2] it would naturally turn their thoughts in that direction. The form of their interpretation would be moulded, both by the astrological opinions of the Jews — which distinctly point to this very conjunction as an indication of the Messiah — and by the expectation of a Deliverer which was so widely spread at the period in which they lived.

The appearance and disappearance of new stars is a phenomenon by no means so rare as to admit of any possible doubt.[3] The fact that St. Matthew speaks of such a star within two or three years, at the utmost, of a time when we know that there was this remarkable planetary conjunction, and the fact that there was such a star nearly 1,600 years

[1] He supposed that the other conjunctions would coincide with seven great climacteric years or epochs: Adam, Enoch, the Deluge, Moses, Isaiah (about the commencement of the Greek, Roman, and Babylonian eras), Christ, Charlemagne, and the Reformation.

[2] Kepler's first tract on this subject was *De nova Stella in pede Serpentarii*, Prague, 1606. He was followed by Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, ii. 406; Pfaff, *Das Licht und die Weltgegenden*, Bamb., 1821; Münter, *Stern d. Weisen*, Copenhag., 1827; Schumacher, Schubert, Encke, Goldschmidt, etc. Professor Pritchard carefully went through Kepler's calculations, and confirms the fact of the conjunction, though he slightly modifies the dates, and, like most recent inquirers, denies that the phenomenon has any bearing on the Gospel narrative. That such astronomical facts are insufficient to explain the language of St. Matthew, if taken with minute and literal accuracy, is obvious; but that they have *no bearing on* the circumstances as they were reported to the Evangelist, perhaps half a century later, is more than can be safely affirmed.

[3] Sepp, who always delights in the most fanciful and unfounded combinations, connects this fact with the *Fish* (ΙΧΘΥΣ = Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτῆρ) as the well-known symbol of the Church and of Christians. (*Leben Jesu*, p. 7.)

afterwards, at the time of a similar conjunction, can only be regarded as a curious coincidence. We should, indeed, have a strong and strange confirmation of one main fact in St. Matthew's narrative, if any reliance could be placed on the assertion that, in the astronomical tables of the Chinese, a record has been preserved that a new star did appear in the heavens at this very epoch.[1] But it would be obviously idle to build on a datum which is so incapable of verification and so enveloped with uncertainty.

We are, in fact, driven to the conclusion that the astronomical researches which have proved the reality of this remarkable planetary conjunction are only valuable as showing the *possibility* that it may have prepared the Magi for the early occurrence of some great event. And this confident expectation may have led to their journey to Palestine, on the subsequent appearance of an evanescent star, an appearance by no means unparalleled in the records of astronomy, but which in this instance[2] seems to rest on the authority of the Evangelist alone.

No one, at any rate, need stumble over the supposition that an apparent sanction is thus extended to the combinations of astrology. Apart from astrology altogether, it is conceded by many wise and candid observers, even by the great Niebuhr, the last man in the world to be carried away by credulity or superstition, that great catastrophes and unusual phenomena in nature have, as a matter of fact — however we may choose to interpret such a fact — synchronized in a remarkable manner with great events in human history.[3] It would not, therefore, imply any prodigious folly on the part of the Magi to regard the planetary con-

[1] This is mentioned by Wieseler, p. 61. We cannot, however, press the Evangelist's use of *ἀστήρ*, "a star," rather than *ἄστρον*, "a constellation;" the two words are loosely used, and often almost indiscriminately interchanged. Further than this it must be steadily borne in mind (v. *supra*, note 2, page 44), that the curious fact of the planetary conjunction, even if it were accompanied by an evanescent star, would not exactly coincide with, though it might to some extent account for, the language used by St. Matthew.

[2] It is remarkable that the celebrated Abarbanel (d. 1508), in his משעה מיני, or "wells of salvation" — a commentary on Daniel — distinctly says that the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn always indicates great events. He then gives five mystic reasons why Pisces should be the constellation of the Israelites, and says that there had been a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces *three years before* the birth of Moses. From a similar conjunction in his own days (1463), he expected the speedy birth of the Messiah. What makes this statement (which is quoted by Münter, *Stern d. Weisen*, § 55; and Ideler, *Handb. d. Chronol.*, ii. 405) more remarkable is, that Abarbanel must have been wholly ignorant of the conjunction in A.U.C. 747. (See Ebrard, *Gosp. Hist.*, E. Tr., p. 178.)

[3] See Niebuhr's *Lect. on Hist. of Rome*, ii. 103, ed. Schmitz.

junction as something providentially significant. And if astrology be ever so absurd, yet there is nothing absurd in the supposition that the Magi should be led to truth, even through the gateways of delusion, if the spirit of sincerity and truth was in them. The history of science will furnish repeated instances, not only of the enormous discoveries accorded to apparent accident, but even of the immense results achieved in the investigation of innocent and honest error. Saul who, in seeking asses, found a kingdom, is but a type of many another seeker in many another age.[1]

The Magi came to Bethlehem, and offered to the young child in his rude and humble resting-place[2] a reverence which we do not hear that they had paid to the usurping Edomite in his glittering palace. "And when they had opened their treasures they presented unto him gifts, gold, and frankincense, and myrrh." The imagination of early Christians has seen in each gift a special significance: myrrh for the human nature, gold to the king, frankincense to the divinity; or, the gold for the race of Shem, the myrrh for the race of Ham, the incense for the race of Japheth;—innocent fancies, only worthy of mention because of their legendary interest, and their bearing on the conceptions of Christian poetry and Christian art.[3]

[1] "Superstition," says Neander, "often paves the way for faith." "How often," says Hamann, "has God condescended not merely to the feelings and thoughts of men, but even to their failings and their prejudices."

[2] Matt. ii. 11 (εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν) seems to show, what would of course be probable, that the stall or manger formed but a brief resting-place. It is needless to call attention to the obvious fact that St. Matthew does not mention the birth in the inn, or the previous journey from Nazareth. It is not *necessary* to assume that he was wholly unaware of these circumstances, though I see no difficulty in the admission that such may have been the case.

[3] "Dant tibi Chaldaei praenuntia munera reges,
Myrrham homo, rex aurum, suscipe thura Deus." (Ps. Claudian.)

"Thus, aurum, myrrham, regique, hominique, Deoque,
Dona ferunt." (Juvenc. *Hist. Ev.* 249.)

"Aurea nascenti fuderunt munera regi,
Thura dedere Deo, myrrham tribuere sepulcro." (Sedulius, ii. 95.)

See, too, Orig. *c. Cels.*, p. 47, Iren. iii. 10, and many other ancient fancies in Hofmann, *Das Leben Jesu nach d. Apokr.*, p. 128; and others may be found in the Latin Hymns of Mauburn, etc.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT, AND THE MASSACRE OF THE INNOCENTS.

"Salvete flores martyrum
Quos, lucis ipso in limine,
Christi insecutor sustulit,
Ceu turbo nascentes rosas."
PRUDENT., *De SS. Innocenti.*

WHEN they had offered their gifts, the Wise Men would naturally have returned to Herod, but being warned of God in a dream, they returned to their own land another way. Neither in Scripture, nor in authentic history, nor even in early apocryphal tradition, do we find any further traces of their existence; but their visit led to very memorable events.

The dream which warned them of danger may very probably have fallen in with their own doubts about the cruel and crafty tyrant who had expressed a hypocritical desire to pay his homage to the Infant King; and if, as we may suppose, they imparted to Joseph any hint as to their misgivings, he too would be prepared for the warning dream which bade him fly to Egypt to save the young child from Herod's jealousy.

Egypt has, in all ages, been the natural place of refuge for all who were driven from Palestine by distress, persecution, or discontent. Rhinokolura, the river of Egypt, or as Milton, with his usual exquisite and learned accuracy, calls it, —

"The brook that parts
Egypt from Syrian ground," [1]

might have been reached by the fugitives in three days; and once upon the further bank, they were beyond the reach of Herod's jurisdiction.

[1] Milton has, however, been misled by the word *wady*, and its translation by "brook" in our version. Mr. Grove informs me that Rhinocolura, now Wady el-Areesh (the *nachal Mitzraïm*, or "river of Egypt," Numb. xxxiv. 5, etc.), is a broad shallow wady with scarcely a trace of a bank. Still, as is usual in desert valleys, a torrent *does* flow through the bottom of it after winter rains.

Of the flight, and its duration, Scripture gives us no further particulars; telling us only that the Holy Family fled by night from Bethlehem, and returned when Joseph had again been assured by a dream that it would be safe to take back the Saviour to the land of His nativity. It is left to apocryphal legends, immortalized by the genius of Italian art, to tell us how, on the way, the dragons came and bowed to Him, the lions and leopards adored Him, the roses of Jericho blossomed wherever His footsteps trod, the palm-trees at His command bent down to give them dates, the robbers were overawed by His majesty, and the journey was miraculously shortened.[1] They tell us further how, at His entrance into the country, all the idols of the land of Egypt fell from their pedestals with a sudden crash, and lay shattered and broken upon their faces, and how many wonderful cures of leprosy and demoniac possession were wrought by His word. All this wealth and prodigality of superfluous, aimless, and unmeaning miracle — arising in part from a mere craving for the supernatural, and in part from a fanciful application of Old Testament prophecies — furnishes a strong contrast to the truthful simplicity of the Gospel narrative. St. Matthew neither tells us where the Holy Family abode in Egypt, nor how long their exile continued; but ancient legends say that they remained two[2] years absent from Palestine, and lived at Mataréëh,[3] a few miles north-east of Cairo, where a fountain was long shown of which Jesus had made the water fresh, and an ancient sycamore under which they had rested. The Evangelist alludes only to the causes of their flight and of their return, and finds in the latter a new and deeper significance for the words of the prophet Hosea, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son."[4]

[1] See the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew xviii.–xxiv.; Arab. Gospel of the Infancy xii.–xxv.; B. H. Cowper, *The Apocr. Gospels*, pp. 56–64, 178–191; Hofmann, pp. 140–183. Many of these legends are mere fanciful representations of Ps. cxlviii. 7; Isa. xi. 6–9; lxv. 25; xix. 1, etc. From the dissemination of the Gospel of the Infancy in Arabia, many of these fables have exercised a strong influence on the Mohammedan legends of Jesus. Some of the Rabbis took occasion from the visit to Egypt to charge Christ with a knowledge of magic. Matathia, in the *Nizzachon*, says that as Jesus did not know the Tetragrammaton, or ineffable name of God, His miracles (the reality of which is not denied) were due to sorcery learnt in Egypt (Sepp, *Leben Jesu*, § xiii.). It is hardly worth while to refer to the preposterous story in the *Toldôth Jeshû* (Wagenseil, *Tela Ignea*, ii. p. 7).

[2] St. Bonaventura (*De Vita Christi*) says *seven* years.

[3] This town is sometimes identified with On, or Heliopolis, where lived Asenath, the wife of Joseph, and where, under the name of Osarsiph, Moses had been a priest. Onias, at the head of a large colony of Jewish refugees, flying from the rage of Antiochus, had founded a temple there and was thus believed to have fulfilled the prophecy of Isa. xix. 19. (Sepp.)

[4] "Finds a new and deeper significance, or, in other words, totally mis-

The flight into Egypt led to a very memorable event. Seeing that the Wise Men had not returned to him, the alarm and jealousy of Herod assumed a still darker and more malignant aspect. He had no means of identifying the royal infant of the seed of David, and least of all would he have been likely to seek for Him in the cavern stable of the village khan. But he knew that the child whom the visit of the Magi had taught him to regard as a future rival of himself or of his house was yet an infant at the breast; and as Eastern mothers usually suckle their children for two years,[1] he issued his fell mandate to slay all the children of Bethlehem and its neighborhood "from two years old and under." Of the method by which the decree was carried out we know nothing. The children may have been slain secretly, gradually, and by various forms of murder; or, as has been generally supposed, there may have been one single hour of dreadful butchery.[2] The decrees of tyrants like Herod are usually involved in a deadly obscurity; they reduce the world to a torpor in which it is hardly safe to speak above a whisper. But the wild wail of anguish which rose from the mothers thus cruelly robbed of their infant children could not be hushed, and they who heard it might well imagine that Rachel, the great ancestress of their race, whose tomb stands by the roadside about a mile from Beth-

understands," is the marginal comment of a friend who saw these pages. And so, no doubt, it might at first appear to our Western and Northern conceptions and methods of criticism; but not so to an Oriental and an Analogist. Trained to regard every word, nay, every letter of Scripture as mystical and divine, accustomed to the application of passages in various senses, *all* of which were supposed to be latent, in some mysterious fashion, under the original utterance, St. Matthew would have regarded his least apparently relevant quotations from, and allusions to, the Old Testament, not in the light of occasional illustrations, but in the light of most solemn prophetic references to the events about which he writes. And in so doing he would be arguing in strict accordance with the views in which those for whom he wrote had been trained from their earliest infancy. Nor is there, even to our modern conceptions, anything erroneous or unnatural in the fact that the Evangelist transfers to the Messiah the language which Hosea had applied to the ideal Israel. The ideal Israel — *i.e.*, the ideal "Jashar" or "Upright Man" — was the obvious and accepted type of the coming Christ.— The quotation is from Hosea xi. 1, and St. Matthew has here referred to the original, and corrected the faulty rendering of the LXX., which is ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ. See Excursus XI., "Old Testament Quotations in the Evangelists."

[1] *Ketubhôth*, 59 *b*; 2 Macc. vii. 27, "gave thee suck three years." Others refer the calculation to the previous appearance of the planetary conjunction; and if this took place A.U.C. 747, and Jesus was born (as is all but certain) A.U.C. 750, it is a curious coincidence that Abarbanel, as we have already mentioned, places the astrological "aspect" which foreshadowed the birth of Moses *three years before* that event took place.

[2] The Protevang. says (xxi. 1) that he despatched the assassins to Bethlehem (ἔπεμψε τοὺς φονευτάς).

lehem, once more, as in the pathetic image of the prophet, mingled her voice with the mourning and lamentation of those who wept so inconsolably for their murdered little ones.[1]

To us there seems something inconceivable in a crime so atrocious; but our thoughts have been softened by eighteen centuries of Christianity, and such deeds are by no means unparalleled in the history of heathen despots and of the ancient world. Infanticide of a deeper dye than this of Herod's was a crime dreadfully rife in the days of the Empire, and the Massacre of the Innocents, as well as the motives which led to it, can be illustrated by several circumstances in the history of this very epoch. Suetonius, in his Life of Augustus, quotes from the life of the Emperor by his freedman Julius Marathus, a story to the effect that shortly before his birth there was a prophecy in Rome that a king over the Roman people would soon be born. To obviate this danger to the Republic, the Senate ordered that all the male children born in that year should be abandoned or exposed; but the Senators, whose wives were pregnant, took means to prevent the ratification of the statute, because each of them hoped that the prophecy might refer to his own child.[2] Again, Eusebius[3] quotes from Hegesippus, a Jew by birth, a story that Domitian, alarmed by the growing power of the name of Christ, issued an order to destroy all the descendants of the house of David. Two grandchildren of St. Jude — "the Lord's brother" — were still living, and were known as the *Desposyni*.[4] They were betrayed to the Emperor by a certain

[1] Jer. xxxi. 15, applied originally to the Captivity. In this quotation also St. Matthew has translated freely from the Hebrew original. The remark of Calvin, that "Matthew *does not mean that the prophet had predicted what Herod should do*, but that, at the advent of Christ, that mourning was renewed which many years before the women of Bethlehem had made," is characterized by his usual strong and honest common sense, and must be borne in mind in considering several of the Gospel references to ancient prophecy. It applies to St. Matthew more strongly than to the other Evangelists. On this, as on other points of exegesis, there can be no question whatever, in the mind of any competent scholar, that the theology of the Reformation, and even of the Fathers, was freer, manlier, less shackled by false theories about inspiration, and less timid of ignorant criticism, than that which claims to be the sole orthodox theology of the present day.

[2] Suet. *Vit. Aug.*, p. 94. — As history, no doubt the anecdote is perfectly worthless, but it is not worthless as illustrating what we otherwise know to have been possible in an age in which, as is still the case in China, infanticide was hardly regarded as a disgrace.

[3] *Hist. Ecc.* iii. 15.

[4] This fact is mentioned by Julius Africanus, who was born at Emmaus, about the beginning of the third century, and who says that he knew some of the Desposyni personally. (Euseb. *Hist. Ecc.* i. 7.)

Jocatus, and other Nazaræan heretics, and were brought into the imperial presence; but when Domitian observed that they only held the rank of peasants, and that their hands were hard with manual toil, he dismissed them in safety with a mixtur · of pity and contempt.

Although doubts have been thrown on the Massacre of the Innocents, it is profoundly in accordance with all that we know of Herod's character. The master-passions of that able but wicked prince were a most unbounded ambition, and a most excruciating jealousy.[1] His whole career was red with the blood of murder. He had massacred priests and nobles; he had decimated the Sanhedrin; he had caused the High Priest, his brother-in-law, the young and noble Aristobulus, to be drowned in pretended sport before his eyes; he had ordered the strangulation of his favorite wife, the beautiful Asmonæan princess Mariamne, though she seems to have been the only human being whom he passionately loved.[2] His sons Alexander, Aristobulus, and Antipater — his uncle Joseph — Antigonus and Alexander, the uncle and father of his wife — his mother-in-law Alexandra — his kinsman Cortobanus — his friends, Dositehus and Gadias, were but a few of the multitudes who fell victims to his sanguinary, suspicious, and guilty terrors. His brother Pheroras and his son Archelaus barely and narrowly escaped execution by his orders. Neither the blooming youth of the prince Aristobulus, nor the white hairs of the king Hyrcanus had protected them from his fawning and treacherous fury. Deaths by strangulation, deaths by burning, deaths by being cleft asunder, deaths by, secret assassination, confessions forced by unutterable torture, acts of insolent and inhuman lust, mark the annals of a reign which was so cruel that, in the energetic language of the Jewish ambassadors to the Emperor Augustus, "the survivors during his lifetime were even more miserable than the sufferers."[3] And as in the case of Henry VIII., every dark and brutal instinct of his character seemed to acquire fresh

[1] Jos. *Antt.* xvi. 5, § 4.

[2] The feelings of Herod towards Mariamne, who, as a Maccabæan princess, had far more right to the sovereignty than himself, were not unlike those of Henry VII. towards Elizabeth of York, and in a less degree those of William III. towards Mary. Herod was well aware that he owed his sovereignty solely to "the almighty Romans." Aristobulus was murdered at the age of eighteen, Hyrcanus at the age of eighty; and he hated them alike for their popularity, and for their Maccabæan origin. More ghosts must have gathered round the dying bed of this "gorgeous criminal" than those which the fancy of Shakespeare has collected round the bed of Richard III.

[3] Jos. *Antt.* xvii. 11, § 2.

intensity as his life drew towards its close. Haunted by the spectres of his murdered wife and murdered sons, agitated by the conflicting furies of remorse and blood, the pitiless monster, as Josephus calls him, was seized in his last days by a black and bitter ferocity, which broke out against all with whom he came in contact.[1] There is no conceivable difficulty in supposing that such a man — a savage barbarian with a thin veneer of corrupt and superficial civilization — would have acted in the exact manner which St. Matthew describes; and the belief in the fact receives independent confirmation from various sources. "On Augustus being informed," says Macrobius, "that *among the boys under two years of age whom Herod ordered to be slain in Syria*, his own son also had been slain," "It is better to be Herod's pig (*ὗν*) than his son (*υἱὸν*)."[2] Although Macrobius is a late writer, and made the mistake of supposing that Herod's son, Antipater, who was put to death about the same time as the Massacre of the Innocents, had actually perished *in* that massacre, it is clear that the form in which he narrates the *bon mot* of Augustus points to some dim reminiscence of this cruel slaughter.

Why then, it has been asked, does Josephus make no mention of so infamous an atrocity? Perhaps because it was performed so secretly that he did not even know of it. Perhaps because, in those terrible days, the murder of a score of children, in consequence of a transient suspicion, would have been regarded as an item utterly insignificant in the list of Herod's murders.[3] Perhaps because it was passed over in

[1] Jos. *Antt.* xvii. 6, § 5, *μέλαινα χολὴ αὐτὸν ᾔρει ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξαγριαίνουσα*: *B. J.* i. 33, § 2, *ἐπτόητο τῷ φόβῳ καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν ὑπονοίαν ἐξερρίπτιζετο.* — "Most miserable family, even to the third generation, to be imbued so deep beyond any other in blood; one steeped in the blood of infant martyrs, the other in that of John the Baptist, and the third who slew James the Apostle with the sword — all three conspicuous in the persecution of Christ." (Williams, *The Nativ.* 132.)

[2] *Saturnal.* ii. 4, "Augustus cum audisset, inter pueros, *quos in Syria Herodes infra bimatum* (cf. Matt. ii. 16, *ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω*; Vulg., "a *bimatu* et infra") *interfici jussit, filium quoque ejus occisum*, ait Melius, est Herodis porcum (*ὗν*) esse quam puerum (*υἱὸν*)." The pun cannot be preserved in English. Augustus meant that Herod's pig, since, as a Jew, he could not eat it, would be safer than his son. Herod had to ask the Emperor's leave before putting his sons to death; and Antipater, whom he ordered to be executed only five days before his death, was the *third* who had undergone this fate. — Macrobius lived about A.D. 400, but he used early materials, and the pun is almost certainly historical.

[3] The probable number of the Innocents has been extraordinarily exaggerated. An Æthopian legend makes them 14,000! Considering that Bethlehem was but a village of perhaps 2,000 inhabitants, we may safely hope that, even in all its boundaries, not more than twenty were sacrificed, and perhaps not half that number; especially as the *ἀπὸ διετοῦς* may mean (as Greswell supposes) "*just beyond* the age of one year."

silence by Nikolaus of Damascus, who, writing in the true spirit of those Hellenizing courtiers, who wanted to make a political Messiah out of a corrupt and blood-stained usurper, magnified all his patron's achievements, and concealed or palliated all his crimes.[1] But the more probable reason is that Josephus, whom in spite of all the immense literary debt which we owe to him, we can only regard as a renegade and a sycophant, did not choose to make any allusion to facts which were even remotely connected with the life of Christ. The single passage in which he alludes to Him is interpolated, if not wholly spurious, and no one can doubt that his silence on the subject of Christianity was as deliberate as it was dishonest.[2]

But although Josephus does not distinctly mention the event, yet every single circumstance which he does tell us about this very period of Herod's life supports its probability. At this very time two eloquent Jewish teachers, Judas and Matthias, had incited their scholars to pull down the large golden eagle which Herod had placed above the great gate of the Temple. Josephus connects this bold attempt with premature rumors of Herod's death; but Lardner's conjecture that it may have been further encouraged by the Messi-

[1] Nikolaus was to Herod what Velleius Paterculus was to Tiberius. Josephus's own opinion of the kind of men who were Herod's creatures and parasites may be found in his *Antt.* xvi. 5, § 4. As to Josephus, his own narrative is his worst condemnation, and De Quincey's estimate of him (*Works*, vi. 272–275) is not too severe. His works betray some of the worst characteristics of the Oriental and the Pharisee. He may have omitted all mention of Christ out of sheer perplexity, although he certainly rejected His Messiahship (Orig. *c. Cels.* i. 35). Nothing is more common in historians and biographers than the deliberate suppression of awkward and disagreeable facts. Justus of Tiberius, another contemporary historian, was also purposely reticent. Does any one doubt the murder of Crispus, because Eusebius takes no notice of it in his life of Constantine? But perhaps, after all, there *is* an allusion—though guarded and distant—to this crime, or at any rate to the circumstances which led to it, in the *Antiquities* of Josephus (xvi. 11, § 7; xvii. 2, § 4), where it is narrated that Herod slew a number of Pharisees and others because they foretold "how God had decreed that Herod's government should cease, and his posterity should be deprived of it." Possibly another allusion (though out of place) may be found in xiv. 9, § 4, where we hear of a clamor against Herod, raised by "*The mothers* of those who had been slain by him."

[2] This celebrated passage is as follows:—*Antt.* xviii. 3, § 3: Γίγνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ [εἴ γε αὐτὸν ἄνδρα λέγειν χρή. ἦν γὰρ] παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητὴς [διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν σὺν ἡδονῇ τἀληθῆ δεχομένων] καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἰουδαίων πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηλάγετο. [Ὁ Χριστὸς, οὗτος ἦν.] Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ γε πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες. [Ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια εἰρηκότων.] Εἰς ἔτι νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοὐδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φῦλον. The only other allusion to Jesus in Josephus is also of dubious authenticity (*Antt.* xx. 9, § 1), where he calls James τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ.

anic hopes freshly kindled by the visit of the Wise Men, is by no means impossible. The attempt, however, was defeated, and Judas and Matthias, with forty of their scholars, were burned alive. With such crimes as this before him on every page, Josephus might well have ignored the secret assassination of a few unweaned infants in a little village. Their blood was but a drop in that crimson river in which Herod was steeped to the very lips.

It must have been very shortly after the murder of the Innocents that Herod died. Only five days before his death he had made a frantic attempt at suicide, and had ordered the execution of his eldest son Antipater. His deathbed, which once more reminds us of Henry VIII., was accompanied by circumstances of peculiar horror, and it has been asserted that he died of a loathsome disease,[1] which is hardly mentioned in history, except in the case of men who have been rendered infamous by an atrocity of persecuting zeal.[2] On his bed of intolerable anguish, in that splendid and luxurious palace which he had built for himself under the palms of Jericho, swollen with disease and scorched by thirst — ulcerated externally and glowing inwardly with a "soft slow fire" — surrounded by plotting sons and plundering slaves, detesting all and detested by all — longing for death as a release from his tortures, yet dreading it as the beginning of worse terrors — stung by remorse, yet still unslaked with murder — a horror to all around him, yet in his guilty conscience a worse terror to himself — devoured by the premature corruption of an anticipated grave — eaten of worms as though visibly smitten by the finger of God's wrath after seventy years of successful villany — the wretched old man, whom men had called the Great, lay in

[1] The *morbus pedicularis*, or phthiriasis. See Lactantius, *De Mortibus persecutorum*, cap. xxxiii., where, describing the disease of Maximian in terms which would serve equally well to record what is told us of the death of Herod, he says, "Percussit eum Deus insanabili plagâ. Nascitur ei ulcus malum in inferiori parte genitalium, serpitque latius . . . . proxima quæque cancer invadit . . . . jam non longe pernicies aberat, et inferiora omnia corripuerat. Computrescunt forinsecus viscera, et in tabem sedes tota dilabitur . . . . Vermes intus creantur. Odor it autem non modo per palatium, sed totam pervadit civitatem." There is more and worse, which I spare the reader, especially since it is very doubtful whether there is such a disease as the *morbus pedicularis*. — There is a somewhat similar account of the deathbed of Henry VIII. in Forster's *Essay on Popular Progress*. "Now Herod died the worst kind of death, suffering punishment for the shed blood of the children," etc. (*Hist. of Jos. the Carpenter*, ix.).

[2] *E.g.*, Antiochus Epiphanes, Sylla, Maximian, Diocletian, Herod the Great, Herod Agrippa, the Duke of Alva, Henry VIII., etc.

savage frenzy awaiting his last hour.[1] As he knew that none would shed one tear for *him*, he determined that they should shed many for *themselves*, and issued an order that, under pain of death, the principal families in the kingdom and the chiefs of the tribes should come to Jericho. They came, and then, shutting them in the hippodrome, he secretly commanded his sister Salome that at the moment of his death they should all be massacred. And so, choking as it were with blood, devising massacres in its very delirium, the soul of Herod passed forth into the night.

In purple robes, with crown and sceptre and precious stones, the corpse was placed upon its splendid bier, and accompanied with military pomp and burning incense to its grave in the Herodium, not far from the place where Christ was born. But the spell of the Herodian dominion was broken, and the people saw how illusory had been its glittering fascination. The day of Herod's death was, as he had foreseen, observed as a festival. His will was disputed; his kingdom disintegrated; his last order was disobeyed; his sons died for the most part in infamy and exile; the curse of God was on his house, and though, by ten wives and many concubines, he seems to have had nine sons and five daughters, yet within a hundred years the family of the *hierodoulos* of Ascalon had perished by disease or violence, and there was no living descendant to perpetuate his name.[2]

If the intimation of Herod's death[3] was speedily given to Joseph, the stay in Egypt must have been too short to influence in any way the human development of our Lord. This may perhaps be the reason why St. Luke passes it over in silence.

It seems to have been the first intention of Joseph to fix his home in Bethlehem. It was the city of his ancestors, and was hallowed by many beautiful and heroic associations.

[1] The title first occurs in Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 5, § 4. He was beginning the thirty-eighth year of his reign. It has been suggested that "the Great" is a mistaken rendering of רבא, "the elder." "Nur aus Missverstandniss eines Hebraischen Ausdruckes;" cf. Ἐγκίας ὁ μέγας (*Antt.* xviii. 8, § 4.) Ewald (*Gesch.* iv. 473) thinks that the name may possibly have originated from coins, as Agrippa I. is called *βασιλεὺς μέγας* on a coin. In this case it may merely imply that he was not a mere tetrarch, or ethnarch, but a king of Palestine—just as Indian princes call themselves *Maharajah*. In any case, "L'épithète de grand que l'histoire lui a donnée est une amère dérision: sa grandeur consistait à être un magnifique esclave, portant des chaines d'or" (Munk, *Palest.*, 560).

[2] Antipater, father of Herod, is said to have been a *hierodoulos* or servitor in a temple of Apollo at Ascalon. Compare the rapid extinction of the sons of Philip the Fair.

[3] The plural *τεθνήκασι* may be merely general, or it is perhaps a reference to Exod. iv. 19.

It would have been easy to find a living there by a trade which must almost anywhere have supplied the simple wants of a peasant family. It is true that an Oriental rarely leaves his home, but when he has been compelled by circumstances to do so, he finds it comparatively easy to settle elsewhere. Having once been summoned to Bethlehem, Joseph might find a powerful attraction in the vicinity of the little town to Jerusalem; and the more so since it had recently been the scene of such memorable circumstances. But, on his way, he was met by the news that Archelaus ruled in the room of his father Herod.[1] The people would only too gladly have got rid of the whole Idumæan race; at the worst they would have preferred Antipas to Archelaus. But Augustus had unexpectedly decided in favor of Archelaus who, though younger than Antipas, was the heir nominated by the last will of his father; and as though anxious to show that he was the true son of that father, Archelaus, even before his inheritance had been confirmed by Roman authority, "had," as Josephus[2] scornfully remarks, "given to his subjects a specimen of his future virtue, by ordering a slaughter of 3,000 of his own countrymen at the Temple." It was clear that under such a government there could be neither hope nor safety; and Joseph, obedient once more to an intimation of God's will, seeking once more the original home of himself and Mary, "turned aside into the parts of Galilee,"[3] where, in remote obscurity, sheltered by poverty and insignificance, the Holy Family might live secure under the sway of another son of Herod — the equally unscrupulous, but more indolent and indifferent Antipas.

[1] Matt. ii. 22. He was saluted "king" by the army, though he declined the title. Similarly Josephus gives the name of "kingdom" to the tetrarchy of Lysanias (*B. J.* ii. 11, § 5). The word βασιλεύει seems, however — if taken quite strictly — to show that the return from Egypt was very shortly after the flight thither; for it was only during a short time after his father's death that Archelaus strictly had the title of king (cf. Jos. *B. J.* ii. 1, § 1). When he went to Rome for the confirmation of his title, Augustus only allowed him to be called ethnarch; but before this time his assumptions of royalty, by sitting on a golden throne, etc., were actually part of Antipater's charges against him, and at this period Josephus distinctly calls him the "king" (*Antt.* xvii. 9, § 2). It is remarkable *how near* the Evangelists often seem to be to an inaccuracy, while yet closer inspection shows them to be, in these very points, minutely accurate.

[2] *Antt.* xvii. 11, § 2. Augustus afterwards banished him for his tyranny and insolence, and he died at Vienne in Gaul, A.D. 7 (id. 13, § 2).

[3] Matt. ii. 22, ἀνεχώρησεν not "returned," but "retired." The same word is used of the flight into Egypt (Matt. ii. 14). St. Luke (ii. 39) was either unaware of the flight into Egypt, or passed it over as having no bearing on his subject.

CHAPTER V.

THE BOYHOOD OF JESUS.

"Try to become little with the Little One, that you may increase in stature with him."—ST. BONAVENTURA, *Vita Christi*, ix.

"Le haut degré de la perfection consiste à participer à l'enfance sacrée de notre très doux, très humble, et très obéissant Serviteur."—ST. FRANÇOIS DE SALES.

THE physical geography of Palestine is, perhaps, more distinctly marked than that of any other country in the world. Along the shore of the Mediterranean runs the Shephelah and the maritime plain, broken only by the bold spur of Mount Carmel; parallel to this is a long range of hills, for the most part rounded and featureless in their character; these, on their eastern side, plunge into the deep declivity of El Ghôr, the Jordan valley; and beyond the Jordan valley runs the straight, unbroken, purple line of the mountains of Moab and Gilead. Thus the character of the country from north to south may be represented by four parallel bands — the Sea-board, the Hill country, the Jordan valley, and the Trans-Jordanic range.

The Hill country, which thus occupies the space between the low maritime plain and the deep Jordan valley, falls in two great masses, the continuity of the low mountain-range being broken by the plain of Jezreel. The southern mass of those limestone hills formed the land of Judea; the northern, the land of Galilee.

Gâlîl, in Hebrew, means "a circle," and the name was originally applied to the twenty cities in the circuit of Kedesh-Naphtali, which Solomon gave to Hiram in return for his services in transporting timber, and to which Hiram, in extreme disgust, applied the name of *Cabûl*, or "disgusting."[1] Thus it seems to have been always the destiny of Galilee to be, despised; and that contempt was likely to be fostered in the

[1] See 1 Kings ix. 13. In Hebrew the word *Cabûl* has no meaning, but it seems to be put as an equivalent for a Phœnician word to which this meaning is assigned. Josephus calls it χαβαλών, and explains it οὐκ ἀρέσκων (*Antt.* viii. 5, § 3).

minds of the Jews from the fact that this district became, from very early days, the residence of a mixed population, and was distinguished as "Galilee of the Gentiles."[1] Not only were there many Phœnicians and Arabs in the cities of Galilee, but, in the time of our Lord, there were also many Greeks, and the Greek language was currently spoken and understood.

The hills which form the northern limit of the plain of Jezreel run almost due east and west from the Jordan valley to the Mediterranean, and their southern slopes were in the district assigned to the tribe of Zebulun.

Almost in the centre of this chain of hills there is a singular cleft in the limestone, forming the entrance to a little valley. As a traveller leaves the plain he will ride up a steep and narrow pathway, broidered with grass and flowers, through scenery which is neither colossal nor overwhelming, but infinitely beautiful and picturesque. Beneath him, on the right-hand side, the vale will gradually widen, until it becomes about a quarter of a mile in breadth. The basin of the valley is divided by hedges of cactus into little fields and gardens, which, about the fall of the spring rains, wear an aspect of indescribable calm, and glow with a tint of the richest green.[2] Beside the narrow pathway, at no great distance apart from each other, are two wells, and the women who draw water there are more beautiful, and the ruddy, bright-eyed shepherd boys who sit or play by the well-sides, in their gay-colored Oriental costume, are a happier, bolder, brighter-looking race than the traveller will have seen elsewhere. Gradually the valley opens into a little natural amphitheatre of hills, supposed by some to be the crater of an extinct volcano; and there, clinging to the hollows of a hill, which rises to the height of some five hundred feet above it, lie, "like a handful of pearls in a goblet of emerald," the flat roofs and narrow streets of a little Eastern town. There is a small church; the massive buildings of a convent; the tall minaret of a mosque; a clear, abundant fountain; houses built of white stone, and gardens scattered among them, umbrageous with figs and olives, and rich with the

[1] Compare Judg. iv. 2, "Harosheth of the Gentiles;" and Isa. ix. 1; Matt. iv. 15; 1 Macc. v. 15–27.

[2] An early pilgrim, Antoninus Martyr, speaks of Nazareth with a sincerity of enthusiasm which many a modern traveller would echo. "In civitate tanta est gratia mulierum Hebraearum ut inter Hebraeas pulcriores non inveniantur, et hoc a S. Mariâ sibi concessum dicunt . . . . *Provincia paradiso similis* in tritico, in frugibus similis Ægypto, sed praecellit in vino et oleo, pomis ac melle." (Quoted by Caspari, p. 53.)

NAZARETH.

white and scarlet blossoms of orange and pomegranate. In spring, at least, everything about the place looks indescribably bright and soft; doves murmur in the trees; the hoopoe flits about in ceaseless activity; the bright blue roller-bird, the commonest and loveliest bird of Palestine, flashes like a living sapphire over fields which are enamelled with innumerable flowers. And that little town is *En Nâzirah*, Nazareth,[1] where the Son of God, the Saviour of mankind, spent nearly thirty years of His mortal life. It was, in fact, His native village, His home for all but three or four years of His life on earth; the village which lent its then ignominious name to the scornful title written upon His cross; the village from which He did not disdain to draw His appellation when He spake in vision to the persecuting Saul.[2] And along the narrow mountain-path which I have described, His feet must have often trod, for it is the only approach by which, in returning northwards from Jerusalem, He could have reached the home of His infancy, youth, and manhood.

What was His manner of life during those thirty years? It is a question which the Christian cannot help asking in deep reverence, and with yearning love; but the words in which the Gospels answer it are very calm and very few.

Of the four Evangelists, St. John, the beloved disciple, and St. Mark, the friend and "son" of St. Peter,[3] pass over these thirty years in absolute, unbroken silence. St. Matthew devotes one chapter to the visit of the Magi, and the flight into Egypt, and then proceeds to the preaching of the Baptist. St. Luke alone, after describing the incidents which marked the presentation in the Temple, preserves for us one inestimable anecdote of the Saviour's boyhood, and one inestimable verse descriptive of His growth till He was twelve years old. And that verse contains nothing for the gratification of our curiosity; it furnishes us with no details of life, no incidents of adventure; it tells us only how, in a sweet and holy childhood, "the child grew and waxed strong

[1] Nazareth is not mentioned in the Old Testament; unless it be identical with Sarid, which is mentioned as the border of the inheritance of Zebulun in Josh. xix. 10, 12. The position accurately corresponds, but it is philologically difficult to suppose that Nazareth is a corruption—as some have suggested—of *En Sarid* (the fountain or spring of Sarid). It has been more usually connected with *Nëtser* (a branch), and perhaps in allusion to this St. Jerome compares it to an opening rose, and calls it "the flower of Galilee." It is not once mentioned by Josephus.

[2] John xix. 19; Luke ii. 51; Acts xxii. 8.

[3] "Marcus, my son" (1 Pet. v. 13). Papias, quoted by Eusebius, says of Mark, ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενομένος ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα (*Hist. Ecc.* iii. 40).

in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him." To this period of His life, too, we may apply the subsequent verse, "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." His development was a strictly human development. He did not come into the world endowed with infinite knowledge, but, as St. Luke tells us, "He gradually advanced in wisdom." [1] He was not clothed with infinite power, but experienced the weaknesses and imperfections of human infancy. He grew as other children grow, only in a childhood of stainless and sinless beauty — "as the flower of roses in the spring of the year, and as lilies by the waters." [2]

There is, then, for the most part a deep silence in the Evangelists respecting this period; but what eloquence in their silence! May we not find in their very reticence a wisdom and an instruction more profound than if they had filled many volumes with minor details?

In the first place, we may see in this their silence a signal and striking confirmation of their faithfulness. We may learn from it that they desired to tell the simple truth, and not to construct an astonishing or plausible narrative. That Christ should have passed thirty years of His brief life in the deep obscurity of a provincial village; that He should have been brought up not only in a conquered land, but in its most despised province; not only in a despised province, but in its most disregarded valley; [3] that during all those thirty years the ineffable brightness of His divine nature should have tabernacled among us, "in a tent like ours, and of the same material," unnoticed and unknown; that during those long years there should have been no flash of splendid circumstance, no outburst of amazing miracle, no "sevenfold chorus of hallelujahs and harping symphonies" to announce, and reveal, and glorify the coming King — this is not what we should have expected — not what *any one* would have been likely to imagine or to invent.

We should not have expected it, but it *was* so; and therefore the Evangelists leave it so; and the very fact of its contradicting all that we should have imagined, is an additional proof that so it must have been. An additional

[1] Luke ii. 52, προέκοπτε σοφία. Cf. Heb. v. 8, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε.

[2] Comp. Ecclus. xxxix. 13, 14, "Hearken unto me, ye holy children, and bud forth as a rose growing by the brook of the field: and give ye a sweet savor as a frankincense, and flourish as a lily, and send forth a smell, and sing a song of praise."

[3] The terms of Isa. ix. 1, 2, show in what estimation Galilee was held. Keim also refers to Jos. *Antt.* xiii. 12, § 1; xiv. 9, § 2.

proof, because the Evangelists must inevitably have been — as, indeed, we know that they *were* — actuated by the same *à priori* anticipations as ourselves; and had there been any glorious circumstances attending the boyhood of our Lord, they, as honest witnesses, would certainly have told us of them; and had they *not* been honest witnesses, they would — if none such occurred in reality — have most certainly invented them. But man's ways are not as God's ways; and because the truth which, by their very silence, the Evangelists record, is a revelation to us of the ways of God, and not of man, therefore it contradicts what we should have invented: it disappoints what, without further enlightenment, we should have desired. But, on the other hand, it fulfils the ideal of ancient prophecy, "He shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground;" and it is in accordance with subsequent allusion, "He made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant."[1]

We have only to turn to the Apocryphal Gospels, and we shall find how widely different is the false human ideal from the divine fact. There we shall see how, following their natural and unspiritual bent, the fabulists of Christendom, whether heretical or orthodox, surround Christ's boyhood with a blaze of miracle, make it portentous, terror-striking, unnatural, repulsive. It is surely an astonishing proof that the Evangelists were guided by the Spirit of God in telling how *He* lived in whom God was revealed to man, when we gradually discover that no profane, no irreverent, even no imaginative hand can touch the sacred outlines of that divine and perfect picture without degrading and distorting it. Whether the Apocryphal writers meant their legends to be accepted as history or as fiction, it is at least certain that in most cases they meant to weave around the brows of Christ a garland of honor. Yet how do their stories dwarf, and dishonor, and misinterpret Him! How infinitely superior is the noble simplicity of that evangelic silence to all the theatrical displays of childish and meaningless omnipotence with which the Protevangelium, and the Psuedo-Matthew, and the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy are full![2] They

[1] Is. liii. 2; Phil. ii. 7. — The Apocryphal Gospels are for the most part mere worthless Hagadôth, in glorification (1) of the birth and virginity of Mary, (2) of the childhood, and (3) of the passion of our Lord. They were widely spread in the East, and traces of them may be found in the Koran (D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* 499).

[2] "Caveat omnia apocrypha. Sciat multa his admixta vitiosa, *et grandis esse prudentiae aurum in luto quaerere.*" (Jer. *Ep. ad Laetam. Praef. ad*

meant to honor Christ; but no invention *can* honor Him; he who invents about Him degrades Him; he mixes the weak, imperfect, erring fancies of man with the unapproachable and awful purposes of God. The boy Christ of the Gospels is simple and sweet, obedient and humble; He is subject to His parents; He is occupied solely with the quiet duties of His home and of His age; He loves all men, and all men love the pure, and gracious, and noble child. Already He knows God as His Father, and the favor of God falls on Him softly as the morning sun-light, or the dew of heaven, and plays like an invisible aureole round His infantine and saintly brow. Unseen, save in the beauty of heaven, but yet covered with silver wings, and with its feathers like gold, the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and rested from infancy upon the Holy Child.

But how different is the boy Christ of the New Testament Apocrypha! He is mischievous, petulant, forward, revengeful. Some of the marvels told of Him are simply aimless and puerile — as when He carries the spilt water in His robe; or pulls the short board to the requisite length; or moulds sparrows of clay, and then claps His hand to make them fly; or throws all the cloths into the dyer's vat, and then draws them out each stained of the requisite color. But some are, on the contrary, simply distasteful and inconsiderate, as when He vexes and shames and silences those who wish to teach Him; or rebukes Joseph; or turns His playmates into kids: and others are simply cruel and blasphemous, as when He strikes dead with a curse the boys who offend or run against Him, until at last there is a storm of popular indignation, and Mary is afraid to let Him leave the house. In a careful search through all these heavy, tasteless, and frequently pernicious fictions, I can find but one anecdote in which there is a touch of feeling, or possibility of truth; and this alone I will quote because it is at any rate harmless, and it is quite conceivable that it may rest upon some slight basis of traditional fact. It is from the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, and runs as follows:[1] —

"Now in the month of Adar, Jesus assembled the boys as if He were their king; they strewed their garments on the ground, and He sat upon them. Then they put on His head

Lib. Regg.) But, as a friend remarks *aurum in lúto quaerere* is, in some sad senses, a business of life.

[1] Cap. 41. I quote the translation of Mr. B. Harris Cowper, whose admirable volume has placed the Apocryphal Gospels within easy reach of all readers, unlearned as well as learned.

a crown wreathed of flowers, and, like attendants waiting upon a king, they stood in order before Him on His right hand and on His left. And whoever passed that way the boys took him by force, crying, 'Come hither and adore the King, and then proceed upon thy way.'"

Yet I am not sure that the sacredness of the evangelic silence is not rudely impaired even by so simple a fancy as this: for it was in utter stillness, in prayerfulness, in the quiet round of daily duties — like Moses in the wilderness, like David among the sheepfolds, like Elijah among the tents of the Bedawin, like Jeremiah in his quiet home at Anathoth, like Amos in the sycamore groves of Tekoa — that the boy Jesus prepared Himself, amid a hallowed obscurity, for His mighty work on earth. His outward life was the life of all those of His age, and station, and place of birth. He lived as lived the other children of peasant parents in that quiet town, and in great measure as they live now. He who has seen the children of Nazareth in their red caftans, and bright tunics of silk or cloth, girded with a many-colored sash, and sometimes covered with a loose outer jacket of white or blue — he who has watched their noisy and merry games, and heard their ringing laughter as they wander about the hills of their little native vale, or play in bands on the hill-side beside their sweet and abundant fountain, may perhaps form some conception of how Jesus looked and played when He too was a child. And the traveller who has followed any of those children — as I have done — to their simple homes, and seen the scanty furniture, the plain but sweet and wholesome food, the uneventful, happy patriarchal life, may form a vivid conception of the manner in which Jesus lived. Nothing can be plainer than those houses, with the doves sunning themselves on the white roofs, and the vines wreathing about them. The mats, or carpets, are laid loose along the walls; shoes and sandals are taken off at the threshold; from the centre hangs a lamp which forms the only ornament of the room; in some recess in the wall is placed the wooden chest, painted with bright colors, which contains the books or other possessions of the family; on a ledge that runs round the wall, within easy reach are neatly rolled up the gay-colored quilts, which serve as beds, and on the same ledge are ranged the earthen vessels for daily use; near the door stand the large common water-jars of red clay with a few twigs and green leaves — often of aromatic shrubs — thrust into their orifices to keep the water cool. At meal-time a painted wooden stool is placed

in the centre of the apartment, a large tray is put upon it, and in the middle of the tray stands the dish of rice and meat, or *libbân*, or stewed fruits, from which all help themselves in common. Both before and after the meal the servant, or the youngest member of the family, pours water over the hands from a brazen ewer into a brazen bowl. So quiet, so simple, so humble, so, uneventful was the outward life of the family of Nazareth.[1]

The reverent devotion and brilliant fancy of the early mediæval painters have elaborated a very different picture. The gorgeous pencils of a Giotto and a Fra Angelico have painted the Virgin and her Child seated on stately thrones, upon floors of splendid mosaic, under canopies of blue and gold; they have robed them in colors rich as the hues of summer or delicate as the flowers of spring, and fitted the edges of their robes with golden embroidery, and clasped them with priceless gems.[2] Far different was the reality. When Joseph returned to Nazareth he knew well that they were going into seclusion as well as into safety; and that the life of the Virgin and the Holy Child would be spent, not in the full light of notoriety or wealth, but in secrecy,[3] in poverty, and in manual toil.

Yet this poverty was not pauperism; there was nothing in it either miserable or abject; it was sweet, simple, contented, happy, even joyous. Mary, like others of her rank, would spin, and cook food, and go to buy fruit, and evening by evening visit the fountain, still called after her "the Virgin's fountain," with her pitcher of earthenware carried on her shoulder or her head. Jesus would play, and learn, and help His parents in their daily tasks, and visit the synagogues on the Sabbath days. "It is written," says Luther, "that there was once a pious godly bishop, who had often earnestly prayed that God would manifest to him what Jesus had done in His youth. Once the bishop had a dream to this effect. He seemed in his sleep to see a carpenter working at his trade, and beside him a little boy who

[1] Some of these facts have been exquisitely represented by Mr. Holman Hunt in his truly noble picture, "The Shadow of Death." The above paragraphs were, however, written before I had seen the picture. Readers of this book may be interested to know that it was in Palestine, and at the author's request, that Mr. Holman Hunt sketched the two engravings which adorn it. It is not often that a chance traveller gets the opportunity as I was fortunate enough to do on several occasions, of seeing the every-day home life and meals of the inhabitants.

[2] As early as 1679 a monograph was written by Rohr, *Pictor errans in Hist. Sacrâ*; and in 1869, by Hilscher, *De erroribus pictorum circa Nativ. Christi*.

[3] John vii. 3–5. Work in Galilee is there called work ἐν κρυπτῷ

was gathering up chips. Then came in a maiden clothed in green, who called them both to come to the meal, and set porridge before them. All this the bishop seemed to see in his dream, himself standing behind the door that he might not be perceived. Then the little boy began and said, 'Why does that man stand there? shall he not also eat with us?' And this so frightened the bishop that he awoke." "Let this be what it may," adds Luther, "a true history or a fable, I none the less believe that Christ in His childhood and youth looked and acted like other children, yet without sin, in fashion like a man."[1]

St. Matthew tells us, that in the settlement of the Holy Family at Nazareth, was fulfilled that which was spoken by the prophets, "He shall be called a Nazarene." It is well known that no such passage occurs in any extant prophecy. If the name implied a contemptuous dislike — as may be inferred from the proverbial question of Nathanael, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"[2] — then St. Matthew may be summing up in that expression the various prophecies so little understood by his nation, which pointed to the Messiah as a man of sorrows. And certainly to this day "Nazarene" has continued to be a term of contempt. The Talmudists always speak of Jesus as "Ha-nozeri;" Julian is said to have expressly decreed that Christians should be called by the less honorable appellation of Galilæans; and to this day the Christians of Palestine are known by no other title than Nusâra.[3] But the explanation which refers St. Matthew's allusion to those passages of prophecy in which Christ is called "the Branch" (*nêtser* נֵצֶר) seems far more probable. The village may have derived this name from no other circumstance than its abundant foliage; but the Old Testament is full of proofs that the Hebrews — who in philology accepted the views of the Analogists — attached immense and mystical importance to mere resemblances in the sound of words. To mention but one single instance, the first chapter of the prophet Micah turns almost entirely

[1] Cf. St. Bonaventura, *Vit. Christi*, xii. "Fancy you see Him busied with His parents in the most servile work of their little dwelling. Did He not help them in setting out the frugal board, arranging the simple sleeping-rooms, nay, and in other yet humbler offices?"

[2] Perhaps in this question, and in the citation of St. Matthew, there may be a play upon the possible derivation of the name from *Nazôra*, "despicable."

[3] In the singular, Nusrâny. On the supposed edict of Julian, see Gibbon, ii. 312 (ed. Milman). If we ever passed a particularly ill-conditioned village in Palestine, my Mohammedan dragoman always rejoiced if he could assure me that the inhabitants were not Moslim but Nusâra — which he rarely lost an opportunity of doing. Cf. Acts xxviii. 22.

on such merely external similarities in what, for lack of a better term, I can only call the physiological quantity of sounds. St. Matthew, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, would without any hesitation have seen a prophetic fitness in Christ's residence at this town of Galilee, because its name recalled the title by which He was addressed in the prophecy of Isaiah.[1]

"Shall the Christ come out of Galilee?" asked the wondering people. "Search and look!" said the Rabbis to Nicodemus, "for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet" (John vii. 41, 52). It would not have needed very deep searching or looking to find that these words were ignorant or false; for, not to speak of Barak the deliverer, and Elon the judge, and Anna the prophetess, three, if not four, of the prophets — and those prophets of the highest eminence, Jonah, Elijah, Hosea, and Nahum — had been born, or had exercised much of their ministry, in the precincts of Galilee.[2] And in spite of the supercilious contempt with which it was regarded, the little town of Nazareth, situated as it was in a healthy and secluded valley, yet close upon the confines of great nations, and in the centre of a mixed population, was eminently fitted to be the home of our Saviour's childhood, the scene of that quiet growth "in wisdom, and stature, and favor with God and man."[3]

[1] Isa. xi. 1. *Tsemach*, the word used in Jer. xxiii. 5; Zech. iii. 8, etc., also means "Branch." Hitzig, with less probability, supposed St. Matthew to allude to Isa. xlix. 6 (Heb.). The explanation of the passage as Ναζιραῖος, a Nazarite, is philologically erroneous and historically false; but something may be said for the derivation from *nōster*, "protecting," so that "he who calls Jesus Nazarene shall, against his will, call Him 'my Saviour,' 'my Protector'" (Bp. Alexander, *Ideas of the Gospels*, p. 6). — The vague διὰ τῶν προφητῶν of Matt. ii. 23 perhaps admits of more than one reference and explanation. For a fuller disquisition on the principles of the explanation offered in the text I must refer to my *Chapters on Language* (second edition), pp. 229–247, in which I have attempted to illustrate this difficult and interesting subject.

[2] Jonah was of Gath-hepher (2 Kings xiv. 25), a town of Zebulun (Josh. xix. 10, 13); Hosea is said to have been of Issachar, and was a Northern prophet; Elkosh, the birthplace of Nahum, was probably in Galilee (Jer. *ad Nah.* i. 1); Thisbe, the supposed birthplace of Elijah, was believed to be in Naphthali (Tobit i. 2, but it is exceedingly uncertain whether התשבי מתשבי may not mean "the stranger, from the strangers") — at any rate, Elijah's main ministry was in Galilee; Elisha was of Abel-meholah, in the Jordan valley. To get over such flagrant carelessness in the taunting question of the Jews some have proposed to give a narrower significance to the name Galilee, and make it mean only Upper Galilee, for the limits of which see Jos. *B. J.* iii. 3, § 1. Among other great names connected with Galilee, Keim mentions the philosopher Aristobulus (of Paneas), the Scribe Nithai of Arbela, Alexander Jannæus, Judas the Gaulonite, and John of Giscala (*Gesch. Jes.* i. 317). A legend mentioned by Jerome also connects the family of St. Paul with Giscala (Jer. *De Vir. Illustr.* 5).

[3] Luke ii. 52. Cf. Prov. iii. 4; Ps. cxi. 10; 1 Sam. ii. 26.

CHAPTER. VI.

JESUS IN THE TEMPLE.

"Omnes venit salvare, infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores; ideo per omnem venit ætatem." — IREN. *Adv. Haeres.* iii. 18.

EVEN as there is one hemisphere of the lunar surface on which, in its entirety, no human eye has ever gazed, while at the same time the moon's librations enable us to conjecture of its general character and appearance, so there is one large portion of our Lord's life respecting which there is no full record; yet such glimpses are, as it were, accorded to us of its outer edge, that from these we are able to understand the nature of the whole.

Again, when the moon is in crescent, a few bright points are visible through the telescope upon its unilluminated part; those bright points are mountain peaks, so lofty that they catch the sunlight. One such point of splendor and majesty is revealed to us in the otherwise unknown region of Christ's youthful years, and it is sufficient to furnish us with a real insight into that entire portion of His life. In modern language we should call it an anecdote of the Saviour's confirmation.

The age of twelve years was a critical age for a Jewish boy. It was the age at which, according to Jewish legend, Moses had left the house of Pharaoh's daughter; and Samuel had heard the Voice which summoned him to the prophetic office; and Solomon had given the judgment which first revealed his possession of wisdom; and Josiah had first dreamed of his great reform. At this age a boy of whatever rank was obliged, by the injunction of the Rabbis and the custom of his nation, to learn a trade for his own support. At this age he was so far emancipated from parental authority that his parents could no longer sell him as a slave. At this age he became a *ben hat-tôrah*, or "son of the Law." Up to this age he was called *katôn*, or "little;" henceforth he was *gadôl*, or "grown up," and was treated more as a man; henceforth, too, he began to wear the *tephillîn*, or "phylacteries,"

and was presented by his father in the synagogue on a Sabbath, which was called from this circumstance the *shabbath tephillîn*. Nay, more, according to one Rabbinical treatise, the *Sepher Gilgulîm*, up to this age a boy only possessed the *nephesh*, or animal life; but henceforth he began to acquire the *ruach*, or spirit, which, if his life were virtuous, would develop, at the age of twenty, into the *nishema*, or reasonable soul.[1]

This period, too — the completion of the twelfth year[2] — formed a decisive epoch in a Jewish boy's education. According to Juda ben Tema,[3] at *five* he was to study the Scriptures (Mikra), at ten the Mishna, at thirteen the Talmud; at eighteen he was to marry, at twenty to acquire riches, at thirty strength, at forty prudence, and so on to the end. Nor must we forget, in considering this narrative, that the Hebrew race, and, indeed, Orientals generally, develop with a precocity unknown among ourselves, and that boys of twelve (as we learn from Josephus) could and did fight in battle, and that, to the great detriment of the race, it is, to this day, regarded as a marriageable age among the Jews of Palestine and Asia Minor.

Now it was the custom of the parents of our Lord to visit Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover. Women were, indeed, not mentioned in the law which required the annual presence of all males at the three great yearly feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles; but Mary, in pious observance of the rule recommended by Hillel,[4] accompanied her husband every year, and on this occasion they took with them the boy Jesus, who was beginning to be of an age to assume the responsibilities of the Law. We can easily imagine how powerful must have been the influence upon His human development of this break in the still secluded life; of this glimpse into the great outer world; of this

[1] Fol. 40, 1. Sepp is my authority for these particulars. These roughly correspond to Philo's division of life into the λογικὴ ἕξις, ἄκρως τελείωσις, and ἀκμὴ, or πέρας αὐξήσεως. — This incident, preserved for us by St. Luke, is of inestimable value as discountenancing that too-prevalent Apollinarian heresy which denies to Christ the possession of a human soul (νοῦς), and gives Him only the Λόγος in lieu of it. It is much the object of the Gospels to reveal to us that He was τελέως (man), as that he was ἀληθῶς (God). (See Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* i. 614, ed. Keble.) — It should be observed that the word used in Luke ii. 40 is πληρούμενον, *implying a course of growth in wisdom*, not πεπληρωμένον, implying a finished and permanent result.

[2] Πεπληρωκὼς ἔτος ἤδη δυωδέκατον (Jos. *Antt.* ii. 9, § 6; v. 10, § 4), the instances of Moses and Samuel. (Keim, i. 416.)

[3] *Pirke Abhôth*, v. 21.

[4] Caspari, p. 64. — "Pascha feminarum est arbitrarium" (*Kiddushin*, f. 61, 3). (Sepp.)

journey through a land of which every hill and every village teemed with sacred memories; of this first visit to that Temple of His Father which was associated with so many mighty events in the story of the kings His ancestors and the prophets His forerunners.

Nazareth lies from Jerusalem at a distance of about eighty miles, and, in spite of the intense and jealous hostility of the Samaritans, it is probable that the vast caravan of Galilæan pilgrims on their way to the feast would go by the most direct and the least dangerous route, which lay through the old tribal territories of Manasseh and Ephraim.[1] Leaving the garland of hills which encircle the little town in a manner compared by St. Jerome to the petals of an opening rose, they would descend the narrow flower-bordered limestone path into the great plain of Jezreel. As the Passover falls at the end of March and the beginning of April, the country would be wearing its brightest, greenest, loveliest aspect, and the edges of the vast cornfields on either side of the road through the vast plain would be woven, like the High Priest's robe, with the blue and purple and scarlet of innumerable flowers.[2] Over the streams of that ancient river, the river Kishon — past Shunem, recalling memories of Elisha as it lay nestling on the southern slopes of Little Hermon — past royal Jezreel, with the sculptured sarcophagi that alone bore witness to its departed splendor — past the picturesque outline of bare and dewless Gilboa — past sandy Taanach, with its memories of Sisera and Barak — past Megiddo, where He might first have seen the helmets and broadswords and eagles of the Roman legionary — the road would lie to En-Gannîm, where, beside the fountains, and amid the shady and lovely gardens which still mark the spot, they would probably have halted for their first night's rest. Next day they would begin to ascend the mountains of Manasseh, and crossing the "Drowning Meadow," as it is now called, and winding through the rich fig-yards and olive groves that fill the valleys of that district, they would leave upon the right the hills which, in their glorious beauty, formed the "crown of pride" of which Samaria boasted, but which, as the prophet foretold, should be as a "fading flower." Their sec-

[1] Two other routes were open to them: one by the sea-coast, past Carmel and Cæsarea to Joppa, and so across the plain to Jerusalem; the other to Tiberias, and then on the eastern bank of the Jordan to the fords of Bethabara. Both of these routes were longer, less frequented, and more liable to the attacks of roving bands.

[2] It was at this time of year that the author visited in 1870 the scenes he is here describing. In the year A.D. 8 the Passover began on April 8.

ond encampment would probably be near Jacob's well, in the beautiful and fertile valley between Ebal and Gerizim, and not far from the ancient Shechem. A third day's journey would take them past Shiloh and Gibeah of Saul and Bethel to Beeroth; and from the pleasant springs by which they would there encamp a short and easy stage would bring them in sight of the towers of Jerusalem. The profane plumage of the eagle-wings of Rome was already overshadowing the Holy City; but, towering above its walls, still glittered the great Temple, with its gilded roofs and marble colonnades, and it was still the Jerusalem of which royal David sang, and for which the exiles by the waters of Babylon had yearned with such deep emotion, when they took their harps from the willows to wail the remorseful dirge that they would remember her until their right hands forgot their cunning. Who shall fathom the unspeakable emotion with which the boy Jesus gazed on that memorable and never-to-be-forgotten scene?

The numbers who flocked to the Passover from every region of the East might be counted by tens of thousands.[1] There were far more than the city could by any possibility accommodate; and then, as now at Easter-time, vast numbers of the pilgrims reared for themselves the little *succôth* — booths of mat, and wicker-work, and interwoven leaves, which provided them with a sufficient shelter for all their wants. The feast lasted for a week — a week, probably, of deep happiness and strong religious emotion; and then, with their mules, and horses, and asses, and camels, the vast caravan would clear away their temporary dwelling-places, and start on the homeward journey. The road was enlivened by mirth and music. They often beguiled the tedium of travel with the sound of drums and timbrels, and paused to refresh themselves with dates, or melons, or cucumbers, and water drawn in skins and waterpots from every springing well and running stream. The veiled women and the stately old men are generally mounted, while their sons or brothers,

[1] Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 1, § 3) calls them "an innumerable multitude;" and in vi. 9, § 3, he mentions the very remarkable fact that Cestius, in order to give Nero some notion of the power of the city, had asked the chief priests to count the number of paschal lambs offered at the Passover, and found that there were no less than 256,500! which (allowing a general average of rather more than ten to each lamb, whereas there were sometimes as many as twenty) would make the number of worshippers no less than 2,700,200, exclusive of all foreigners, and all who were ceremonially unclean, etc. The assertion that Agrippa reckoned 12,000,000 worshippers by counting the kidneys of the lambs offered, is one of the usual Rabbinic exaggerations.

with long sticks in their hands, lead along by a string their beasts of burden. The boys and children sometimes walk and play by the side of their parents, and sometimes, when tired, get a lift on horse or mule. I can find no trace of the assertion or conjecture [1] that the women, and boys, and men formed three separate portions of the caravan, and such is certainly not the custom in modern times. But, in any case, among such a sea of human beings, how easy would it be to lose one young boy! [2]

The apocryphal legend says that on the journey from Jerusalem the boy Jesus left the caravan and returned to the Holy City.[3] With far greater truth and simplicity St. Luke informs us that — absorbed in all probability in the rush of new and elevating emotions — He "tarried behind in Jerusalem." A day elapsed before the parents [4] discovered their loss; this they would not do until they arrived at the place of evening rendezvous, and all day long they would be free from all anxiety, supposing that the Boy was with some other group of friends or relatives in that long caravan. But when evening came, and their diligent inquiries [5] led to no trace of Him, they would learn the bitter fact that He was altogether missing from the band of returning pilgrims. The next day, in alarm and anguish — perhaps, too, with some sense of self-reproach that they had not been more faithful to their sacred charge — they retraced their steps to Jerusalem. The country was in a wild and unsettled state. The ethnarch Archelaus, after ten years of a cruel and disgraceful reign, had recently been deposed by the Emperor, and banished to Vienne, in Gaul. The Romans had annexed the province over which he had ruled, and the introduction of their system of taxation by Coponius, the first procurator, had kindled the revolt which, under Judas of Gamala and the Pharisee Sadoc, wrapped the whole coun-

[1] Which first occurs, I believe, in Bede.

[2] The incident constantly occurs to this day in the annual expeditions of the pilgrims to bathe in the fords of Jordan. At Easter I met hundreds of Mohammedan pilgrims streaming southwards to the "Tomb of Moses."

[3] Lange here particularizes too much, both in assuming that there was a separate company of boys; and that "the Child — He knew not how — fell out of the train of boys, and went on, led by the Spirit, meditating, longing, attracted, and carried along by His own infinite thoughts until He stood in the Temple, in the midst of the Rabbis."

[4] The proper reading of Luke ii. 43 is almost certainly *οἱ γονεῖς*, which has, for dogmatic reasons, been dishonestly altered into *Ἰωσὴφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ* (see Lightfoot, *Rev. of the New Test.*, p. 29). The place where they first halted might very well be, as tradition says, El Bireh, the ancient Beeroth, about six miles north of Jerusalem.

[5] Luke ii. 44, *ἀνεζήτουν*.

try in a storm of sword and flame.[1] This disturbed state of the political horizon would not only render their journey more difficult when once they had left the shelter of the caravan, but would also intensify their dread lest, among all the wild elements of warring nationalities which at such a moment were assembled about the walls of Jerusalem, their Son should have met with harm. Truly on that day of misery and dread must the sword have pierced through the virgin mother's heart!

Neither on that day, nor during the night, nor throughout a considerable part of the third day, did they discover Him, till at last they found Him in the place which, strangely enough, seems to have been the last where they searched for Him — in the Temple, "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions; and all that heard Him were astonished at His understanding and answers."

The last expression, no less than the entire context, and all that we know of the character of Jesus and the nature of the circumstances, shows that the Boy was there to inquire and learn — not, as the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy[2] represents it, to cross-examine the doctors "each in turn" — not to expound the number of the spheres and celestial bodies, and their natures and operations — still less to "explain physics and metaphysics, hyperphysics and hypophysics" (!) All these are but the Apollinarian fictions of those who preferred their heretical and pseudo-reverential fancies of what was fitting, to the simple truthfulness with which the Evangelist lets us see that Jesus, like other children, grew up in gradual knowledge, consistently with the natural course of human development. He was there, as St. Luke shows us, in all humility and reverence to His elders, as an eager-hearted and gifted learner, whose enthusiasm kindled their admiration, and whose bearing won their esteem and

[1] The insurrection of Judas was A.D. 6 — *i.e.*, only two years before this event. It will be seen (Exc. I. *infr.*, "The Date of Christ's Birth") that A.U.C. 750 (B.C. 4) seems to me the almost certain date of the Nativity.

[2] Ch. xlviii.-lii. Not of this kind was the wisdom in which He grew. "La sagesse dont il est question, ce n'est pas la sagesse selon le monde, mais la sagesse selon Dieu. Ce n'est ni cette philosophie superbe dont se vantait la Grèce, et qu'elle inculquait si soigneusement à la génération naissante; ni cette prudence de la vie, par laquelle les enfants de ce siècle surpassent les enfants de la lumière; ni cette instruction des livres que les hommes d'étude ramassent avec tant de travail; ni même la connaissance speculative de Dieu et des saints mystères de sa Parole. Il s'agit ici de cette sagesse si souvent louée dans les livres du roi Salomon, dont la première leçon est, 'Crains Dieu, et garde ses commandements.'" (Adolphe Monod, *Enfance de Jésus*, p. 9.)

love.[1] All tinge of arrogance and forwardness was utterly alien to His character, which, from His sweet childhood upward, was meek and lowly of heart. Among those present may have been — white with the snows of well-nigh a hundred years — the great Hillel, one of the founders of the Masôrah, whom the Jews almost reverence as a second Moses; and his son the Rabban Simeon, who thought so highly of silence; and his grandson, the refined and liberal Gamaliel; and Shammai, his great rival, a teacher who numbered a still vaster host of disciples; and Hanan, or Annas, son of Seth, His future judge; and Boethus, the father-in-law of Herod; and Babha Ben Butah, whose eyes Herod had put out; and Nechaniah Ben Hiskanah, so celebrated for his victorious prayers; and Johanan Ben Zacchai, who predicted the destruction of the Temple; and the wealthy Joseph of Arimathea; and the timid but earnest Nicodemus; and the youthful Jonathan Ben Uzziel, who subsequently wrote the celebrated Chaldee paraphrase, and was held by his contemporaries in boundless honor.[2] But though none of these might conjecture Who was before them — and though hardly one of them lived to believe on Him, and some to oppose Him in years to come — which of them all would not have been charmed and astonished at a glorious and noble-hearted Boy, in all the early beauty of His life, who, though He had never learned in the schools of the Rabbis, yet showed so marvellous a wisdom, and so deep a knowledge in all things Divine?[3]

[1] "The Rabbis themselves said," observes Stier, "that the word of God out of the mouths of children is to be received as from the mouth of the Sanhedrin, of Moses, of the Blessed God Himself" (*Bammidbar Rabba*, 14). (Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus*, i. 20, E. Tr.) — Anything like forwardness in boys was peculiarly distasteful to the Jews (*Abhôth*, v. 12, 15).

[2] Sepp, *Leben Jesu*, i. § 17; but I do not pledge myself to the exactitude of his conjecture in this enumeration. For some further allusions to these Rabbis with Talmudic references to the traditions about them, see Etheridge's *Hebrew Literature*, p. 38. In a blasphemous Jewish book, the *Toldôth Jeshû* (which is not older than the thirteenth century, though Voltaire supposed it to belong to the first), Hillel and Shammai are represented as having reproved Jesus for having come into the Temple with His head uncovered. Nothing whatever new or true respecting Jesus is to be learnt from the Talmud (see Excursus II. *infr.*, "Christ and Christians in the Talmud"), and least of all from this sickening and worthless piece of blasphemy, which he who wills may read in Wagenseil's *Tela Ignea Satanae*, 1681.

[3] Incidents somewhat similar in their external circumstances were by no means unknown. They are narrated of R. Eliezer Ben Azaria, a descendant in the tenth generation of Ezra; and of R. Ashe, the first compiler of the Babylonian Talmud. (Sepp, *Leben Jesu*, *ubi supr.*) Josephus *Vita*, 2), with the imperturbable egotism and naïve self-complacency which characterized him, narrates how, when he was about fourteen years of age,

Here then — perhaps in the famous *Lishcath haggazzîth*, or "Hall of Squares"— perhaps in the *Chanujôth*, or "Halls of Purchase," or in one of the spacious chambers assigned to purposes of teaching[1] which adjoined the Court of the Gentiles — seated, but doubtless at the feet of His teachers, on the many-colored mosaic which formed the floor, Joseph and Mary found the Divine Boy. Filled with that almost adoring spirit of reverence for the great priests and religious teachers of their day which characterized at this period the simple and pious Galilæans, they were awe-struck to find Him, calm and happy, in so august a presence.[2] They might, indeed, have known that He was wiser than His teachers, and transcendently more great; but hitherto they had only known Him as the silent, sweet, obedient Child, and perhaps the incessant contact of daily life had blunted the sense of His awful origin. Yet it is Mary, not Joseph, who alone ventures to address Him in the language of tender reproach. "My child, why dost Thou treat us thus? see, Thy father and I were seeking Thee with aching hearts."[3] And then follows His answer, so touching in its innocent simplicity, so unfathomable in its depth of consciousness, so infinitely memorable as furnishing us with the *first recorded words* of the Lord Jesus:

"*Why is it that ye were seeking me? Did ye not know that I must be about my Father's business?*"[4]

This answer, so divinely natural, so sublimely noble, bears upon itself the certain stamp of authenticity. The conflict of thoughts which it implies; the half-vexed astonishment which it expresses that they should so little understand Him; the perfect dignity, and yet the perfect humility which it combines, lie wholly beyond the possibility of invention. It is in accordance, too, with all His ministry — in accordance with that utterance to the tempter, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth

the chief priests and Rabbis at Jerusalem frequently visited him to hear the understanding with which he answered the most difficult questions on the hidden meaning of the Law.

[1] The *Lishcath haggazzith* was a basilica of hewn square stones (built B.C. 110 by Simon Ben Shetach), in which both priests and Sanhedrin met, till they were transferred to the *chanujôth*. It opened both on the Court of the Priests and on that of the Gentiles. (*Joma*, 25 *a*; *Shabbah*, 15 *a*, in Ginsburg, s.v. "Sanhedrin," Kitto's *Cyclop.*)

[2] The word is a strong one, ἐξεπλάγησιν (Luke ii. 48).

[3] Luke ii. 48, ὀδυνώμενοι ἐζητοῦμεν.

[4] ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου, sc. πράγμασιν (Luke ii. 49). It *might* mean "in my father's house;" but the other rendering is wider and better. Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 15; Gen. xli. 51, LXX.

out of the mouth of God," and with that quiet answer to the disciples by the well of Samaria, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." Mary had said unto Him, "Thy father," but in His reply He recognizes, and henceforth He knows, *no* father except His Father in heaven. In the "Did ye not *know*," He delicately recalls to them the fading memory of all that they *did* know; and in that "*I* must," He lays down the sacred law of self-sacrifice by which He was to walk, even unto the death upon the cross.

"And they understood not the saying which He spake unto them." They — even they — even the old man who had protected His infancy, and the mother who knew the awful secret of His birth — understood not, that is, not in their *deeper* sense, the significance of those quiet words. Strange and mournful commentary on the first recorded utterance of the youthful Saviour, spoken to those who were nearest and dearest to Him on earth! Strange, but mournfully prophetic of all His life: — "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." [1]

And yet, though the consciousness of His Divine parentage was thus clearly present in His mind — though one ray from the glory of His hidden majesty had thus unmistakably flashed forth — in all dutiful simplicity and holy obedience "He went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them."

[1] John i. 10, 11. It should be rather "unto His own possession (εἰς τὰ ἴδια), and His own people (οἱ ἴδιοι) received Him not."

CHAPTER VII.

THE HOME AT NAZARETH.

Αὐξάνων κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων. — JUST. MART. *Dial. c. Tryph.* 88.

SUCH, then, is the "solitary floweret out of the wonderful enclosed garden of the thirty years, plucked precisely there where the swollen bud, at a *distinctive crisis*, bursts into flower."[1]

But if of the first twelve years of His human life we have only this single anecdote, of the next eighteen years of His life we possess no record whatever, save such as is implied in a single word.

That word occurs in Mark vi. 3: "Is not this *the carpenter*?"[2]

We may be indeed thankful that the word remains, for it is full of meaning, and has exercised a very noble and blessed influence over the fortunes of mankind. It has tended to console and sanctify the estate of poverty; to ennoble the duty of labor; to elevate the entire conception of manhood, as of a condition which in itself alone, and apart from every adventitious circumstance, has its own grandeur and dignity in the sight of God.

[1] Stier, i. 18.

[2] It is, no doubt, on dogmatical grounds that this was altered into "the son of the carpenter" in the later MSS., though not in a single uncial. Some were offended that the Lord of All should have worked in the shop of a poor artisan; but how alien to the true spirit of Christianity is this feeling of offence! Origen, indeed says (*c. Cels.* vi. 36) that nowhere in the Gospels is Jesus himself called a carpenter; but this is probably a mere slip of memory, or may only prove how early the Christians grew ashamed of their Divine Master's condescension, and how greatly they needed the lessons which it involves. That even "the carpenter's son" became a term of reproach among the Gentiles, is clear from the story of Libanius's question to a Christian during Julian's expedition into Persia, "What is the Carpenter's Son doing now?" The Christian answered, "He is making a coffin;" and soon came the news of Julian's death. The omission of Joseph's name in Mark v. 3 has been universally accepted as an indication that he was dead; otherwise we might suppose that something contemptuous was intended by only mentioning the mother's name (see Ewald, *Gram. Arabica*, ii. 4, *note*). For this reference I am indebted to Mr. C. J. Monro.

1. It shows, for instance, that not only during the three years of His ministry, but throughout the whole of His life, our Lord was poor. In the *cities* the carpenters would be Greeks, and skilled workmen; the carpenter of a provincial village — and, if tradition be true, Joseph was "not very skilful" — can only have held a very humble position, and secured a very moderate competence.[1] In all ages there has been an exaggerated desire for wealth; an exaggerated admiration for those who possess it; an exaggerated belief of its influence in producing or increasing the happiness of life; and from these errors a flood of cares and jealousies and meannesses have devastated the life of man. And therefore Jesus chose voluntarily "the low estate of the poor" — not, indeed, an absorbing, degrading, grinding poverty, which is always rare, and almost always remediable, but that commonest lot of honest poverty, which, though it necessitates self-denial, can provide with ease for all the necessaries of a simple life. The Idumæan dynasty that had usurped the throne of David might indulge in the gilded vices of a corrupt Hellenism, and display the gorgeous gluttonies of a decaying civilization; but He who came to be the Friend and the Saviour, no less than the King of All, sanctioned the purer, better, simpler traditions and customs of His nation,[2] and chose the condition in which the vast majority of mankind have ever, and must ever live.

2. Again, there has ever been, in the unenlightened mind, a love of idleness; a tendency to regard it as a stamp of aristocracy; a desire to delegate labor to the lower and weaker, and to brand it with the stigma of inferiority and contempt.[3]

[1] Arab. Gosp. Inf. xxxviii. Unfortunately, Pagan writers do not add one single fact to our knowledge of the life of Jesus (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; Plin. *Epp.* x. 97; Suet. *Claud.* 25; Lucian, *De Mort. Peregr.* 11; Lamprid *Alex. Sev.* 29, 43). A few passages in the Vera Hist. of the Pseudo-Lucian are probably meant to ridicule Gospel narratives, and a few passages in the Life of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus, and the Life of Pythagoras by Jamblichus—the "cloudy romances of Pagan sophists"—are perhaps intended by way of parallel. Jewish writers are just as barren. Josephus and Justus of Tiberias passed over the subject with obvious and unworthy reticence. The Talmudists simply preserved or invented a few turbid and worthless calumnies.

[2] Philo, *in Flac.* 977 f.

[3] To the Greeks and Romans all mechanical trade was *βάναυσος, i.e.*, mean, vulgar, contemptible, and was therefore left to slaves. The Jews, with a truer and nobler wisdom, enacted that every boy should learn a trade, and said with R. Juda b. Ilai, "the wise," that "labor honors the laborer." Saul was a tent-maker. Up to the age of forty, R. Johanan, son of Zakki, afterwards president of the Sanhedrin, was, like Mahomet, a merchant; the Rabbis Juda and Menahem were bakers; R. Eliezer, supreme president of the schools of Alexandria, was a smith; R. Ismael, a needle-

But our Lord wished to show that labor is a pure and a noble thing; it is the salt of life; it is the girdle of manliness; it saves the body from effeminate languor, and the soul from polluting thoughts. And therefore Christ labored, working with His own hands, and fashioned ploughs and yokes for those who needed them. The very scoff of Celsus against the possibility that *He* should have been a carpenter who came to save the world,[1] shows how vastly the world has gained from this very circumstance — how gracious and how fitting was the example of such humility in One whose work it was to regenerate society, and to make all things new.

3. Once more, from this long silence, from this deep obscurity, from this monotonous routine of an unrecorded and uneventful life, we were meant to learn that our *real* existence in the sight of God consists in the inner and not in the outer life. The world hardly attaches any significance to any life except those of its heroes and benefactors, its mighty intellects, or its splendid conquerors. But these are, and must ever be, the few. One raindrop of myriads falling on moor or desert, or mountain — one snowflake out of myriads melting into the immeasurable sea — is, and must be, for most men the symbol of their ordinary lives. They die, and barely have they died, when they are forgotten; a few years pass, and the creeping lichens eat away the letters of their names upon the churchyard stone; but even if those crumbling letters were still decipherable, they would recall no memory to those who stand upon their graves. Even common and ordinary men are very apt to think themselves of much importance; but, on the contrary, not even the greatest man is in any degree necessary, and after a very short space of time —

> "His place, in all the pomp that fills
> The circuit of the summer hills,
> Is that his grave is green."

maker; R. Joza Ben Chalaphta, a tanner. (Sepp, § 19; Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclop.*, s.v. "Education.") The Rabbis even assumed and rejoiced in the titles of R. Johanan, the shoemaker; R. Simon, the weaver, etc. Labor and learning were, in the eyes of the Rabbis, good antidotes against sinful thoughts (*Pirke Abhôth*, fol. 2, 2). — Even the Rabbis, however, were not far enough advanced to honor labor *without* learning, and, as we shall see hereafter, they spoke contemptuously of uneducated artisans and common tillers of the soil (*vid. infra*, p. 82).

[1] Justin Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* 88, τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὢν ἄροτρα καὶ ζύγα, διὰ τούτων τὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης σύμβολα διδάσκων καὶ ἐνεργῆ βίον. (There is no necessity, with Neander, to translate ζύγα, "scales.") The supposed allusions to the trade of a carpenter in Matt. vi. 27; Luke xxiii. 31, etc., are obviously too vague to have any bearing on this question.

4. A relative insignificance, then, is, and must be, the destined lot of the immense majority, and many a man might hence be led to think, that since he fills so small a space — since, for the vast masses of mankind, he is of as little importance as the ephemerid which buzzes out its little hour in the summer noon — there is nothing better than to eat, and drink, and die. But Christ came to convince us that a *relative* insignificance may be an *absolute* importance.[1] He came to teach that continual excitement, prominent action, distinguished services, brilliant success, are no essential elements of true and noble life, and that myriads of the beloved of God are to be found among the insignificant and the obscure. "*Si vis divinus esse, late ut Deus,*" is the encouraging, consoling, ennobling lesson of those voiceless years. The calmest and most unknown lot is often the happiest, and we may safely infer that these years in the home and trade of the carpenter of Nazareth were happy years in our Saviour's life. Often, even in His later days, it is clear that His words are the words of one who rejoiced in spirit; they are words which seem to flow from the full river of an abounding happiness. But what must that happiness have been in those earlier days, before the storms of righteous anger had agitated his unruffled soul, or His heart burned hot with terrible indignation against the sins and hypocrisies of men? "*Heaven,*" as even a Confucius could tell us, "*means principle;*" and if at all times innocence be the only happiness, how great must have been the happiness of a sinless childhood! "Youth," says the poet-preacher, "danceth like a bubble, nimble and gay, and shineth like a dove's neck, or the image of a rainbow which hath no substance, and whose very image and colors are fantastical." And if this description be true of even a careless youth, with what transcendently deeper force must it apply to the innocent, the sinless, the perfect youth of Christ? In the case of many myriads, and assuredly not least in the case of the saints of God, a sorrowful and stormy manhood has often been preceded by a calm and rosy dawn.

5. And while they were occupied manually, we have positive evidence that these years were not neglected intellectually. No importance can be attached to the clumsy stories of the Apocryphal Gospels, but it is possible that some religious and simple instruction may have been given to the

[1] Tu homo, TANTUM NOMEN, si intelligas te" (Tert. *Apol. adv. Gent.* xlviii.).

"We are greater than we know."—*Wordsworth.*

little Nazarenes by the *sopherîm*, or other attendants of the synagogue;[1] and here our Lord, who was made like unto us in all things, may have learnt, as other children learnt, the elements of human learning. But it is, perhaps, more probable that Jesus received his early teaching at home, and in accordance with the injunctions of the Law (Deut. xi. 19), from His father. He would, at any rate, have often heard in the daily prayers of the synagogue all which the elders of the place could teach respecting the Law and the Prophets. That He had not been to Jerusalem, for purposes of instruction, and had not frequented any of the schools of the Rabbis, is certain from the indignant questions of jealous enemies, "From whence hath this man these things?" "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?"[2] There breathes throughout these questions the Rabbinic spirit of insolent contempt for the *am ha-arets* (עם הארץ) or illiterate countryman. The stereotyped intelligence of the nation, accustomed, if I may use the expression, to that mummified form of a dead religion which had been embalmed by the Oral Law, was incapable of appreciating the divine originality of a wisdom learnt from God alone. They could not get beyond the sententious error of the son of Sirach, that "the wisdom of the learned man cometh by opportunity of leisure."[3] Had Jesus received the slightest tincture of their technical training He would have been *less*, not *more*, effectually armed for putting to shame the supercilious exclusiveness of their narrow erudition.

6. And this testimony of His enemies furnishes us with a convincing and fortunate proof that His teaching was not, as

[1] The Talmud certainly proves their *later* existence, and that the *sopherîm* and *chazanim* of the synagogues acted as *mikreâardike* — i.e., *mikrodidaktici*, or private teachers of the young. But the *chazzan* of our Lord's day was in a much humbler position than was the case later. The regular foundation of schools for *infants* is said to have been due to Jesus the son of Gamaliel I. See the whole question examined by Winer, *Realwörterb.* s.v. *Unterricht;* Jost, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, iii. 163; and Keim, *Jesu*, i. 428. On the familiarity of Jewish children with the Law see Jos. *Antt.* iv. 8, § 12; Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 118.

[2] Mark vi. 2; John vi. 42; vii. 15. The *am ha-arets*, according to R. Eliezer, is one who does not say the *Shema* (Hear, O Israel) morning and evening. According to R. Joshua, one who wore no *tephillîn* (phylacteries); according to Ben Assai, one who did not wear *tsitsith* (tassels); according to R. Nathan, one who had no *mezuzah* above his door; according to R. Nathan Ben Joseph, one who did not train his sons in the Law; but according to R. Hona, the true *Halachah* ("rule") was with those *who, even if they had read the Scriptures and the Mishna, had not attended the school of any Rabbi.* (*Bab. Berachôth*, fol. 47, 6; *v. infr.*, vol. i., p. 424; Gfrörer, *Jahrhund. d. Heils*, i.188.)

[3] Ecclus. xxxviii. 24. For the continuation of the passage, *v. infra*, p.82.

some would insinuate, a mere eclectic system borrowed from the various sects and teachers of His times. It is certain that He was never enrolled among the scholars of those Scribes[1] who made it their main business to teach the traditions of the fathers. Although schools in great towns had been founded eighty years before, by Simon Ben Shatach, yet there could have been no Beth Midrash or Beth Rabban, no "vineyard" or "array" at despised and simple Nazareth.[2] And from whom could Jesus have borrowed? — From Oriental Gymnosophists or Greek Philosophers? No one, in these days, ventures to advance so wild a proposition.[3] — From the *Pharisees?* The very foundations of their system, the very idea of their religion, was irreconcilably alien from all that He revealed. — From the *Sadducees?* Their epicurean insouciance, their "expediency" politics, their shallow rationalism, their polished sloth, were even more repugnant to true Christianity, than they were to sincere Judaism. — From the *Essenes?* They were an exclusive, ascetic, and isolated community, with whose discouragement of marriage, and withdrawal from action, the Gospels have no sympathy, and to whom our Lord never alluded, unless it be in those passages where he reprobates those who abstain from anointing themselves when they fast,[4] and who hide their candle under a bushel. — From *Philo*, and the Alexandrian Jews? Philo was indeed a good man, and a great thinker, and a contemporary of Christ;[5] but (even if his name had ever been heard — which is exceedingly doubtful — in so remote a region as Galilee) it would be impossible, among the world's philosophies, to choose any system less like the doctrines which Jesus taught, than the mystic theosophy and allegorizing extravagance of that "sea of abstractions" which lies congealed in

[1] Jos. *Antt.* xv. 10, § 5. Sometimes an educated slave acted as home-tutor.

[2] כרם, "vineyard," סדרא, "array," and other similar names, were given by the Jews to their schools (Dr. Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclop.* i. 728).

[3] For numerous monographs on all these theories, see Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 73.

[4] Jos. *B. J.* ii. 8, § 3.

[5] Philo was probably born B.C. 20, and lived till about A.D. 50. As we know that he once visited Jerusalem, it is just possible (no more) that he *may* have seen Jesus. The tendency of his spiritualism was "to exalt knowledge in place of action; its home was in the cells of the recluse, and not in the field or the market; its truest disciples were visionary Therapeutæ, and not Apostles charged with a Gospel to the world." Alexandrianism "was the ideal of heathen religion and the negation of Christianity. . . . It suppressed the instincts of civil and domestic society which Christianity ennobled; it perpetuates the barriers which Christianity removed; it abandoned the conflict which Christianity carries out to victory." (Westcott, *Introd.*, p. 77.)

his writings. — From *Hillel* and *Shammai?* We know but little of them; but although, in one or two passages of the Gospels, there may be a conceivable allusion to the disputes which agitated their schools, or to one or two of the best and truest maxims which originated in them, such allusions, on the one hand, involve no more than belongs to the common stock of truth taught by the Spirit of God to men in every age; and, on the other hand, the system which Shammai and Hillel taught was that oral tradition, that dull dead Levitical ritualism, at once arrogant and impotent, at once frivolous and unoriginal, which Jesus both denounced and overthrew.[1] The schools in which Jesus learnt were not the schools of the Scribes, but the school of holy obedience, of sweet contentment, of unalloyed simplicity, of stainless purity, of cheerful toil. The lore in which he studied was not the lore of Rabbinism, in which to find one just or noble thought he must wade through masses of puerile fancy and cabalistic folly, but the Books of God without Him, in Scripture, in Nature, and in Life; and the Book of God within Him, written on the fleshly tables of the heart.

The education of a Jewish boy of the humbler classes was almost solely scriptural and moral,[2] and his parents were, as a rule, his sole teachers. We can hardly doubt that the child Jesus was taught by Joseph and Mary to read the Shema (Deut. vi. 4), and the Hallel (Ps. cxiv.–cxviii.), and the simpler parts of those holy books, on whose pages His divine wisdom was hereafter to pour such floods of light.

But He had evidently received a further culture than this.

[1] We shall see hereafter that in all questions such as that respecting divorce, the decisions of Jesus were wholly different from those either of Hillel or of Shammai. Can it be regarded as certain that Hillel occupied among his contemporaries anything like the space which he occupies in tradition? Unless he be the same as Pollio (*Antt.* xv. 1, § 1; 10, § 4) — which, to say the least, is very doubtful, for Pollio seems to be Abtalion who preceded Hillel — Josephus *does not even mention him*, though there could be no possible reason, whether of timidity or of uncertainty, to pass over his name, as he passes over that of Jesus. I shall speak of the supposed relation of Jesus to Hillel in Excursus III., "Jesus and Hillel," and may refer to Ewald, *Gesch. Christ.* 28–39.

[2] Exod. xii. 26; Deut. *passim*; Acts xxii. 3; 2 Tim. iii. 15. In Ecclus. xxxviii. 24 seqq., there is a striking contrast between the limited studies and opportunities of the poor and the range and leisure of the rich. "The wisdom of a learned man cometh by opportunity of leisure. . . . How can he get wisdom that holdeth the plough, ... that driveth oxen, ... and *whose talk is of bullocks?* . . . . *So every carpenter and workmaster* that laboreth night and day . . . . All these trust to their hands. . . . . They shall not be sought for in public counsel, nor set high in the congregation, ... and they shall not be found where parables are spoken; . . . . but . . . . their desire is in the work of their craft."

(i.) The art of writing is by no means commonly known, even in these days, in the East; but more than one allusion to the form of the Hebrew letters,[1] no less than the stooping to write with His finger on the ground,[2] show that our Lord could write. (ii.) That His knowledge of the sacred writings was deep and extensive — that, in fact, He must almost have known them by heart — is clear, not only from His direct quotations, but also from the numerous allusions which He made to the Law and to the Hagiographa, as well as to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Joel, Hosea, Micah, Zechariah, Malachi, and, above all, to the Book of Psalms.[3] It is probable, though not certain, that He was acquainted with the uncanonical Jewish books.[4] This profound and ready knowledge of the Scriptures gave more point to the half-indignant question, so often repeated, "*Have ye not read?*" (iii.) The language which our Lord commonly spoke was Aramaic; and at that period Hebrew was completely a dead language, known only to the more educated, and only to be acquired by labor; yet it is clear that Jesus was acquainted with it, for some of His scriptural quotations[5] directly refer to the Hebrew original. Greek too He must have known, for it was currently spoken in towns so near his home as Sepphoris, Cæsarea, and Tiberias.[6] Meleager, the poet of the Greek anthology, in his epitaph on himself, assumes that his Greek will be intelligible to Syrians

[1] Matt. v. 18. Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13) gives the spurious letter which Christ was asserted to have written (Cedrenus, *Hist.*, p. 145, adds ἰδίαις χερσί) to Abgarus, King of Edessa. Cf. Arab. Gosp. Inf. xlviii.; Ps. Matth. xxxi.

[2] John viii. 6 (in M.S. U), τῷ δακτύλῳ ἔγραφεν ἑκάστου αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας. (See Hofmann, p. 309; Fabr. *Cod. ap.* N. T. i. 315; Wagenseil *ad. Sot.* p. 33.) The common use of the *mezuzôth* (Deut. vi. 9) and *tephillîn* hardly show that the art of writing was common.

[3] These all occur in St. Matthew's Gospel.

[4] Cf. Matt. xi. 28 seq. with Ecclus. li. 26, etc., and Luke xiv. 28 with 2 Macc. ii. 29, 30 (Keim, i. 455). Every respectable family possessed at least a portion of the sacred books. Prof. Plumptre (*Christ and Christendom*, p. 96) has observed that James "the Lord's brother" certainly makes allusions to the Apocrypha (cf. James i. 6, 8, 25 with Ecclus. vii. 10; i. 28; xiv. 23).

[5] Mark xii. 29, 30; Luke xxii. 37; Matt. xxvii. 46.

[6] The coinage of the Herods has Greek inscriptions (De Saulcy, *Hist. d'Hérode*, p. 385). The study of Greek was encouraged by some Rabbis; they said that the *tallîth* of Shem and the *pallium* of Japhet ought to be united (*Midrash Rabba*, Gen. xxxiv.). As a rule, however, they did not value the acquisition of languages (Jos. *Antt.* xx. 11, § 2); and the learning of Greek was absolutely forbidden during the Roman war (*Sota*, ix. 14). Gamaliel alone, of the Rabbis, permitted his scholars to study Greek literature (*chochmath Javanith*); and Rabbi Ismael said that Greek wisdom should only be taught at the hour which was *neither day nor night*, since the Law was to be studied *day and night* (*Menachôth*, 19 *b*). But see Excursus IV., "Greek Learning."

and Phœnicians: he also speaks of his native Gadara, which was at no great distance from Nazareth, as though it were a sort of Syrian Athens. Ever since the days of Alexander the Great, alike in the contact of the Jews with Ptolemies, and with Seleucids, Hellenic influences had been at work in Palestine. Greek was, indeed, the common medium of intercourse, and without it Jesus could have had no conversation with strangers — with the centurion, for instance, whose servant He healed, or with Pilate, or with the Greeks who desired an interview with Him in the last week of His life.[1] Some too of His scriptural quotations, if we can venture to assume a reproduction of the *ipsissima verba*,[2] are taken directly from the Greek version of the Septuagint, even where it differs from the Hebrew original.[3] Whether He was acquainted with Latin is much more doubtful, though not impossible. The Romans in Judæa must by this time have been very numerous, and Latin was inscribed upon the coins in ordinary use.[4] But to whatever extent He may have known these languages, it is clear that they exercised little or no influence on His human development, nor is there in all His teaching a single indisputable allusion to the literature, philosophy, or history of Greece or Rome.[5] And that Jesus habitually *thought* in that Syriac which was his native tongue may be conjectured, without improbability, from some curious plays on words which are lost in the Greek of the Gospels, but which would have given greater point and beauty to some of His utterances, as spoken in their original tongue.[6]

[1] Matt. viii. 6–9; xxvii. 11; John xii. 21.

[2] Of course we cannot assume this in all cases. *χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκοίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεῦσαι* (Thuc. i. 22), and although the Holy Evangelists have been guided from above to reveal all that is essential to our salvation in the life of Christ, yet their variations show that they were not endowed with a verbal exactitude, which would have been at once supernatural and needless.

[3] Matt. iv. 7; xiii. 14, 15.

[4] Matt. xxii. 19. Wernsdorf wrote a treatise *De Christo Latine loquente*. The Latin words, *μόδιον*, *κοδράντην*, *λεγεών*, etc., occur in our Lord's teaching.

[5] It is surely very far-fetched to find, as some have done, a possible allusion to the death of Socrates in Mark xvi. 18. On the other hand, there is a (perhaps accidental) resemblance between the *ἄγραφον δόγμα* of our Lord preserved by St. Paul in Acts xx. 35, and the Epicurean maxim *ἥδιον τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν τοῦ εὖ πάσχειν*. (Cf. Athen. *Deipnos.* viii. 5; Arist. *Eth. Nic.* iv. 1.) J. F. Mayer wrote a pamphlet, *Utrum Christus legerit Platonem vel Terentium?* Hamb. 1701.

[6] See Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 501, s.v. *Sprache;* Glass, *Philologia Sacra*, p. 918, seq., "We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced (רְקַדְתֶּם, *raked-toon*); we have mourned unto you, and ye have not wept (אַרְקַדְתֶּם, *arkêd-toon*);" other supposed instances are adduced in Heinsius's *Aristarchus*. The words, *γολγοθᾶ*, *ταλιθᾶ*, *κοῦμι*, *ἀββᾶ*, *κῆφας*, etc., are all Aramaic (or, as it

7. But whatever the boy Jesus may have learned as child or boy in the house of His mother, or in the school of the synagogue, we know that His best teaching was derived from immediate insight into His Father's will. In the depths of His inmost consciousness, did that voice of God, which spake to the father of our race as he walked in the cool evening under the palms of Paradise, commune — more plainly, by far — with Him. He heard it in every sound of nature, in every occupation of life, in every interspace of solitary thought. His human life was "an ephod on which was inscribed the one word God." Written on His inmost spirit, written on His most trivial experiences, written in sunbeams, written in the light of stars, He read everywhere His Father's name. The calm, untroubled seclusion of the happy valley, with its green fields and glorious scenery, was eminently conducive to a life of spiritual communion; and we know how from its every incident — the games of its innocent children,[1] the buying and selling in its little market-place, the springing of its perennial fountain, the glory of its mountain lilies in their transitory loveliness, the hoarse cry in their wind-rocked nest of the raven's callow brood — He drew food for moral illustration and spiritual thought.

Nor must we lose sight of the fact that it was in these silent, unrecorded years that a great part of His work was done. He was not only "girding His sword upon His thigh," but also wielding it in that warfare which has no discharge.[2] That noiseless battle, in which no clash of weapons sounds, but in which the combatants against us are none the less terrible because they are not seen, went on through all the years of His redeeming obedience. In these years He "began to do" long before He "began to teach."[3] They were the years of a sinless childhood, a sinless boyhood, a sinless youth, a sinless manhood, spent in that humility, toil, obscurity, submission, contentment, prayer, to make them an eternal example to all our race. We cannot imitate Him in the occupations of His ministry, nor can we even remotely reproduce in our own experience the external circumstances of His life during those three crowning years. But the vast majority of us are

is called, Syro-Chaldee); as is the cry upon the cross, "*Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani.*" The particular dialect of Galilee was marked by a change of gutturals, and a general *πλατασμός*. (Lightfoot, and Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr. in* Matt. xxvi. 73.)

[1] Matt. xi. 16.

[2] Ps. xlv. 3; Eccles. viii. 8.

[3] Acts i. 1. See further on this subject the note at the end of Chap. IX., p. 116.

placed, by God's own appointment, amid those quiet duties of a commonplace and uneventful routine which are most closely analogous to the thirty years of His retirement; it was during these years that His life is for us the main example of how we ought to live. "Take notice here," says the saintly Bonaventura, "that His doing nothing wonderful was in itself a kind of wonder. For His whole life is a mystery; and as there was power in His actions, so was there power in His silence, in His inactivity, and in His retirement. This sovereign Master, who was to teach all virtues, and to point out the way of life, began from His youth up, by sanctifying in His own person the practice of the virtuous life He came to teach, but in a wondrous, unfathomable, and, till then, unheard-of manner."

His mere presence in that home of His childhood must have made it a happy one. The hour of strife, the hour of the sword, the hour when many in Israel should rise or fall because of Him, the hour when the thoughts of many hearts should be revealed, the hour when the kingdom of heaven should suffer violence, and the violent take it by force, was not yet come. In *any* family circle the gentle influence of one loving soul is sufficient to breathe around it an unspeakable calm; it has a soothing power like the shining of the sunlight, or the voice of doves heard at evening: —

> "It droppeth, like the gentle dew from heaven,
> Upon the place beneath."

Nothing vulgar, nothing tyrannous, nothing restless can permanently resist its beneficent sorcery; no jangling discord can long break in upon its harmonizing spell. But the home of Jesus was no ordinary home. With Joseph to guide and support, with Mary to hallow and sweeten it, with the youthful Jesus to illuminate it with the very light of heaven, we may well believe that it was a home of trustful piety, of angelic purity, of almost perfect peace, a home for the sake of which all the earth would be dearer and more awful to the watchers and holy ones, and where, if the fancy be permitted us, they would love to stay their waving wings. The legends of early Christianity tell us that night and day, where Jesus moved and Jesus slept, the cloud of light shone round about Him. And so it was; but that light was no visible Shechînah; it was the beauty of holiness; it was the peace of God.

8. In the eleventh chapter of the Apocryphal History of Joseph the Carpenter, it is stated that Joseph had four elder

sons and several daughters by a previous marriage, and that the elder sons, Justus and Simon, and the daughters, Esther and Thamar, in due time married and went to their houses. "But Judas and James the Less, and the Virgin my mother," continues the speaker, who is supposed to be Jesus Himself, "remained in the house of Joseph. I also continued along with them, not otherwise than if I had been one of his sons. I passed all my time without fault. I called Mary my mother, and Joseph father, and in all they said I was obedient to them, nor did I ever resist them, but submitted to them . . . . nor did I provoke their anger any day, nor return any harsh word or answer to them; on the contrary, I cherished them with immense love, as the apple of my eye."

This passage, which I quote for the sake of the picture which it offers of the unity which prevailed in the home at Nazareth, reminds us of the perplexed question, Had our Lord any actual uterine brothers and sisters? and if not, who were those who in the Gospels are so often called "the brethren of the Lord"? Whole volumes have been written on this controversy, and I shall not largely enter on it here, both because I do not wish these pages to be controversial, and because I have treated it elsewhere.[1] The evidence is so evenly balanced, the difficulties of each opinion are so clear, that to insist very dogmatically on any positive solution of the problem would be uncandid and contentious. Some, in accordance certainly with the *primâ facie* evidence of the Gospels, have accepted the natural supposition that, after the miraculous conception of our Lord, Joseph and Mary lived together in the married state, and that James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon, with daughters, whose names are not recorded, were subsequently born to them. According to this view, Jesus would be the eldest, and, on the death of Joseph, which, if we may follow tradition, took place when He was nineteen, would assume the natural headship and support of the orphaned family.[2] But according to another view, of which St. Jerome may be called the inventor, these brethren of our Lord were in reality His cousins. Mary, it is believed,

[1] In Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v. "Brother." Certainly the Hieronymian and Epiphanian theories (see next note) are an *afterthought*, caused by a growing tendency to magnify the ἀειπαρθενία. This notion was partly due to the development of ascetic opinions, partly to a fantastic allegorical interpretation of Ezek. xliv. 2.

[2] So much, and so much that is most easily accessible, has been written on this point — a point which is, after all, incapable of positive solution — that it will be needless to enter elaborately upon it here, especially as Dr. Lightfoot, in an appendix to his edition of the Epistle to the Galatians,

had a sister or half-sister of the same name,[1] who was married to Alphæus or Clopas, and these were their children. I have in the note reviewed some of the evidence. Each person can form upon that evidence a decided conviction of his own, but it is too scanty to admit of any positive conclusion in which

has treated it with his usual exhaustive learning and accuracy. Dismissing all minor and arbitrary combinations, there are three main views: (1) The *Helvidian* — that the brethren of the Lord were the actual children of Joseph and Mary; (2) the *Hieronymian* — that they were his first cousins, being sons of Mary and Alphæus; (3) the *Epiphanian* — that they were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage. Of these three theories, the second — that of St. Jerome — is decidedly the most popular, and the one which has *least* to be said for it. It has not a particle of tradition before the time of St. Jerome in its favor, since the Papias, who is quoted as having held it, is, as Dr. Lightfoot shows, a writer of the eleventh century. Even St. Jerome, after his residence in Palestine, seems to have abandoned it; and it is perhaps sufficient to observe that, as it assumes three at least of these "brethren" to have been actual apostles, it is in flagrant contradiction to John vii. 5, to say nothing of the fact that it depends on a number of very dubious hypotheses. The Epiphanian theory seems to have been the tradition of Palestine, and is the one current in the Apocryphal Gospels (see Hofmann, *Leben Jesu*, 4); but I still believe that the Helvidian has an overwhelming preponderance of argument in its favor. The only two serious arguments against it are: (*α*) The fact that our Lord entrusted His mother to the care of St. John, not of her own children; but this is accounted for by their acknowledged want of sympathy with Him up to that time. It is true that the appearance of the risen Christ to James (1 Cor. xv. 7, see Lightfoot *ubi supr.*, p. 260) seems to have wholly converted them; but there may have been many reasons why Mary should still live with the Apostle to whom the Lord had entrusted her. (*β*) The fact that the names of the sons of Alphæus were identical with those of the Lord's brethren; but this argument loses all force from the extreme commonness of these names, which were as common among the Jews as John and William among us. The genealogies of Joseph show, moreover, that they were in part family and ancestral names. The imagined necessity of the ἀειπαρθενία is no argument whatever, since it is abundantly clear that, had the Evangelists believed in the importance of such a view, or held the superior sacredness of celibacy over marriage, they would either have stated their belief, or would at any rate have abstained from language which, in its obvious and only natural significance, conveys the reverse notion. For undoubtedly the Helvidian view — that they were actual sons of Joseph and Mary — is most in accordance with the simple interpretation of the Gospel narratives. Not to dwell on the πρωτότοκος of Luke ii. 7, and the ἕως οὗ of Matt. i. 25, and the πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς of Matt. i. 18, we have (*α*) the fact that they are *always* called ἀδελφοί, never ἀνέψιοι or συγγενεῖς (a fact which appears to me to be alone decisive against the Hieronymian view, for reasons which I have given *s.v.* "Brother" in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*); and (*β*) the fact that they are always found accompanying the Virgin (John ii. 12; Matt. xii. 46), and not their own (supposed) mother, without the slightest hint that they were not in reality her own children. To these I would add, as against the Epiphanian theory, that, had the "brethren" been elder sons of Joseph, Jesus would not have been regarded by any of His followers as legal heir to the throne of David (see not only Matt. i. 16; Luke i. 27; but also Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim ii. 8; Rev. xxii. 16).

[1] That two sisters should both have received the same name seems very improbable. The custom of the Herodian family would be little likely to prevail among the peasants of Nazareth. I have, however, discovered one modern instance of such a fact, and there are doubtless others.

we may expect a general acquiescence. In any case, it is clear that our Lord, from His earliest infancy, must have been thrown into close connection with several kinsmen, or brothers, a little older or a little younger than Himself, who were men of marked individuality, of burning zeal, of a simplicity almost bordering on Essenic asceticism, of overpowering hostility to every form of corruption, disorder, or impurity, of strong devotion to the Messianic hopes, and even to the ritual observances of their country.[1] We know that, though afterwards they became pillars of the infant Church, at first they did not believe in our Lord's Divinity, or at any rate held views which ran strongly counter to the divine plan of His self-manifestation.[2] Not among these, in any case, did Jesus during His lifetime find His most faithful followers, or His most beloved companions. There seemed to be in them a certain strong opinionativeness, a Judaic obstinacy, a lack of sympathy, a deficiency in the elements of tenderness and reverence. Peter, affectionate even in his worst weakness, generous even in his least controlled impulse; James the son of Zebedee, calm and watchful, reticent and true; above all, John, whose impetuosity lay involved in a soul of the most heavenly tenderness, as the lightning slumbers in the dewdrop — these were more to Him and dearer than His brethren or kinsmen according to the flesh. A hard aggressive morality is less beautiful than an absorbing and adoring love.[3]

9. Whether these little clouds of partial miscomprehension tended in any way to overshadow the clear heaven of Christ's

[1] Especially Jude and James, if, as seems at least possible, *they* were "the Lord's brethren," and authors of the epistles which pass by their names, but were not actual apostles (see James i. 1; Jude 17).

[2] John vii. 3, 4; Mark iii. 21. Can there be any stronger evidence of the perfect simplicity and truthfulness of the Gospel evidence than the fact that they faithfully record what sceptics are pleased to consider so damaging an admission? It is exactly the reverse of what is said in the Apocr. Gospels, *e.g.* Apocr. Gosp. Matt. xliii.

[3] If, as Wieseler (*Die Sohne Zebedäi, Vettern des Herrn*, *Stud., und Krit.* 1840) with great probability supposes, there be any truth in the tradition (Nicephorus, *Hist. Ecc.* ii. 3) that Salome was the sister of Mary, delicately alluded to but unnamed in John xix. 25 (as compared with Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40), then James and John the sons of Zebedee were actually first cousins of our Lord. In that case there would still be nothing surprising in their having first been disciples of the Baptist, for Mary and Elisabeth were related (Luke i. 36), and the ministry of John preceded that of Jesus. [Ewald even supposes that the Virgin was of the tribe of Levi, and connects with this not only the fact that Jesus wore a seamless coat (John xix. 23), but also the story (Polycrates in Euseb. *Hist. Ecc.* iii. 31, v. 24) that St. John in his old age wore the priestly πέταλον (Deut. xxxiii. 8) (see *Gesch. Christ.*, p. 246). He accepts the conjecture and tradition that St. John was related to Jesus, *id.* p. 239.]

youth in the little Galilæan town, we cannot tell. It may be that these brethren toiled with Him at the same humble trade, lived with Him under the same humble roof. But, however this may be, we are sure that He would often be alone. Solitude would be to Him, more emphatically than to any child of man, "the audience-chamber of God;" He would beyond all doubt seek for it on the gray hill-sides, under the figs and olive-trees, amid the quiet fields; during the heat of noonday, and under the stars of night. No soul can preserve the bloom and delicacy of its existence without lonely musing and silent prayer; and the greatness of this necessity is in proportion to the greatness of the soul. There were many times during our Lord's ministry when, even from the loneliness of desert places, He dismissed His most faithful and most beloved, that He might be yet more alone.

10. It has been implied that there are but two spots in Palestine where we may feel an absolute moral certainty that the feet of Christ have trod, namely — the well-side at Shechem, and the turning of that road from Bethany over the Mount of Olives from which Jerusalem first bursts upon the view.[1] But to these I would add at least another — the summit of the hill on which Nazareth is built. That summit is now unhappily marked, not by any Christian monument, but by the wretched, ruinous, crumbling *wely* of some obscure Mohammedan saint.[2] Certainly there is no child of ten years old in Nazareth now, however dull and unimpressionable he may be, who has not often wandered up to it; and certainly there could have been no boy at Nazareth in olden days who had not followed the common instinct of humanity by climbing up those thymy hill-slopes to the lovely and easily accessible spot which gives a view of the world beyond. The hill rises six hundred feet above the level of the sea. Four or five hundred feet below lies the happy valley. The view from this spot would in any country be regarded as extraordinarily rich and lovely; but it receives a yet more indescribable charm from our belief that here, with His feet among the mountain flowers, and the soft breeze lifting the hair from His temples, Jesus must often have watched the eagles poised in the cloudless blue, and have gazed upwards as He heard overhead the rushing plumes of the long line of pelicans, as they winged their way from the streams of Kishon to the Lake of Galilee. And what a vision would be outspread before Him, as He sat at spring-time on the green and

[1] Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.*, p. 194. [2] Neby Ismaîl.

thyme-besprinkled turf! To Him every field and fig-tree, every palm and garden, every house and synagogue, would have been a familiar object; and most fondly of all amongst the square flat-roofed houses would His eyes single out the little dwelling-place of the village carpenter. To the north, just beneath them, lay the narrow and fertile plain of Asochis,[1] from which rise the wood-crowned hills of Naphtali; and conspicuous on one of them was Safed, "the city set upon a hill;"[2] beyond these, on the far horizon, Hermon upheaved into the blue the huge splendid mass of his colossal shoulder, white with eternal snows.[3] Eastward, at a few miles' distance, rose the green and rounded summit of Tabor, clothed with terebinth and oak. To the west He would gaze through that diaphanous air on the purple ridge of Carmel, among whose forests Elijah had found a home; and on Caifa and Accho, and the dazzling line of white sand which fringes the waves of the Mediterranean, dotted here and there with the white sails of the "ships of Chittim."[4] Southwards, broken only by the graceful outlines of Little Hermon and Gilboa, lay the entire plain of Esdraelon, so memorable in the history of Palestine and of the world; across which lay the southward path to that city which had ever been the murderess of the prophets, and where it may be that even now, in the dim foreshadowing of prophetic vision, He foresaw the agony in the garden, the mockings and scourgings, the cross and the crown of thorns.

The scene which lay there outspread before the eyes of the youthful Jesus was indeed a central spot in the world which He came to save. It was in the heart of the Land of Israel, and yet — separated from it only by a narrow boundary of hills and streams — Phœnicia, Syria, Arabia, Babylonia, and Egypt lay close at hand. The Isles of the Gentiles, and all the glorious regions of Europe, were almost visible over the shining waters of that Western sea. The standards of Rome were planted on the plain before Him; the language of Greece was spoken in the towns below. And, however peaceful it then might look, green as a pavement of emeralds, rich with its gleams of vivid sunlight, and the purpling shadows which floated over it from the clouds of the latter rain,

[1] Now called El Buttauf.

[2] The present town of Safed is of much later date; but *a* city or fortress most probably existed there in our Lord's time.

[3] The epithet is so far accurate, that even in September snow would be found in the ravines and crevices of Hermon. (*Report of Pal. Explor. Fund*, 1870, p. 213.)

[4] I describe the scene as I saw it on Easter Sunday, April 17, 1870.

it had been for centuries a battle-field of nations. Pharaohs and Ptolemies, Emîrs and Arsacids, Judges and Consuls, had all contended for the mastery of that smiling tract. It had glittered with the lances of the Amalekites; it had trembled under the chariot-wheels of Sesostris; it had echoed the twanging bow-strings of Sennacherib; it had been trodden by the phalanxes of Macedonia; it had clashed with the broadswords of Rome; it was destined hereafter to ring with the battle-cry of the Crusaders, and thunder with the artillery of England and of France. In that Plain of Jezreel, Europe and Asia, Judaism and Heathenism, Barbarism and Civilization, the Old and the New Covenant, the history of the past and the hopes of the present, seemed all to meet. No scene of deeper significance for the destinies of humanity could possibly have arrested the youthful Saviour's gaze.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BAPTISM OF JOHN.

"John than which man a sadder or a greater
Not till this day has been of woman born;
John like some iron peak by the Creator
Fired with the red glow of the rushing morn." — MYERS.

THUS then his boyhood, and youth, and early manhood had passed away in humble submission and holy silence, and Jesus was now thirty years old.[1] That deep lesson for all classes of men in every age, which was involved in the long toil and obscurity of those thirty years, had been taught more powerfully than mere words could teach it, and the hour for His ministry and for the great work of His redemption had now arrived. He was to be the Saviour not only by example, but also by revelation, and by death.

And already there had begun to ring that Voice in the Wilderness which was stirring the inmost heart of the nation with its cry, "Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

It was an age of transition, of uncertainty, of doubt. In the growth of general corruption, in the wreck of sacred institutions, in those dense clouds which were gathering more and more darkly on the political horizon, it must have seemed to many a pious Jew as if the fountains of the great deep were again being broken up. Already the sceptre had departed from his race; already its high-priesthood was contemptuously tampered with by Idumæan tetrarchs or Roman procurators; already the chief influence over his degraded Sanhedrin was in the hands of supple Herodians or wily Sadducees. It seemed as if nothing were left for his consolation but an increased fidelity to Mosaic institutions, and a deepening intensity of Messianic hopes. At an epoch so troubled, and so restless — when old things were rapidly passing away, and the new continued unrevealed — it might almost seem excus-

[1] On the elaborate chronological data for the commencement of the Baptist's ministry given by St. Luke (iii. 1, 2), see Excursus I., "Date of Christ's Birth."

able for a Pharisee to watch for every opportunity of revolution; and still more excusable for an Essene to embrace a life of celibacy, and retire from the society of man. There was a general expectation of that "wrath to come," which was to be the birth-throe of the coming kingdom — the darkness deepest before the dawn.[1] The world had grown old, and the dotage of its paganism was marked by hideous excesses. Atheism in belief was followed, as among nations it has always been, by degradation of morals. Iniquity seemed to have run its course to the very farthest goal. Philosophy had abrogated its boasted functions except for the favored few. Crime was universal, and there was no known remedy for the horror and ruin which it was causing in a thousand hearts. Remorse itself seemed to be exhausted, so that men were "past feeling."[2] There was a callosity of heart, a petrifying of the moral sense, which even those who suffered from it felt to be abnormal and portentous.[3] Even the heathen world felt that "the fulness of the time" had come.

At such periods the impulse to an ascetic seclusion becomes very strong. Solitary communion with God amid the wildest

[1] Mal. iii. 1; iv. 2. The *ἐκκόπτεται* and *βάλλεται* of Matt. iii. 10 are the so-called *praesens futurascens* — i.e., they imply that the fiat had gone forth; that the law had already begun to work; that the doom was now in course of accomplishment. Probably the words "kingdom of heaven" (*malkûth shamajîm*) and "coming time" (*olam ha-ba*) were frequent at this time on pious lips; but the Zealots were expecting a warrior as Messiah; and the school of Shammai a legalist; and the Essenes an ascetic; and the philosophic schools some divine vision (Philo, *De Execratt.* ii. 435; Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, iii. 218). It has been impossible for me here to enter into the vast literature about the Messianic conception prevalent to the time of our Lord; but it seems clear that Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Keim (as against Volkmar, etc.) are right in believing that there *was* at this time a fully developed Messianic tradition. The decision depends mainly on the date of various Apocryphal writings — the Book of Enoch, the Fourth Book of Esdras, the Ascension of Moses, the Psalms of Solomon, the third book of the Sibylline prophecies, etc. See especially Hilgenfeld's *Messias Judaeorum*. He certainly proves that the 2d Psalm of Solomon was written about B.C. 48.

[2] *πᾶν εἶδος κακίας διεξελθοῦσα ἡ φύσις ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐδεῖτο θεραπείας* (Theophyl.); Eph. iv. 19, *ἀπηλγηκότες*. I have slightly sketched the characteristics of this age in *Seekers after God*, pp. 36–53; a powerful picture of its frightful enormities may be seen in Renan, *L'Antechrist*, or Döllinger, *The Jew and the Gentile*. It were better to know nothing of it, than to seek a notion of its condition in the pages of Juvenal, Martial, Suetonius, Apuleius, and Petronius. Even in the case of Dr. Döllinger's book, one cannot but feel that he might have attended to the noble rule of Tacitus, "Scelera ostendi oportet dum puniuntur, *abscondi flagitia*" (Tac. *Germ.* 12). Too much of what has been written on the abysmal degradations of a decadent Paganism resembles the Pharos lights which sometimes caused the shipwreck of those whom they were meant to save. There are some things which, as a Church Father says of the ancient pantomimes, "*ne accusari quidem possunt honeste*."

[3] *πώρωσις τῆς καρδίας* (Eph. iv. 17–19). *ἀπολίθωσις* (Epict. *Diss.* i. 53).

scenes of nature seems preferable to the harassing speculations of a dispirited society. Self-dependence, and subsistence upon the very scantiest resources which can supply the merest necessities of life, are more attractive than the fretting anxieties and corroding misery of a crushed and struggling poverty. The wildness and silence of indifferent Nature appear at such times to offer a delightful refuge from the noise, the meanness, and the malignity of men. Banus, the Pharisee, who retired into the wilderness, and lived much as the hermits of the Thebaid lived in after years, was only one of many who were actuated by these convictions. Josephus, who for three years[1] had lived with him in his mountain-caves, describes his stern self-mortifications and hardy life, his clothing of woven leaves, his food of the chance roots which he could gather from the soil, and his daily and nightly plunge in the cold water that his body might be clean and his heart pure.

But asceticism may spring from very different motives. It may result from the arrogance of the cynic who wishes to stand apart from all men; or from the disgusted satiety of the epicurean who would fain find a refuge even from himself; or from the selfish terror of the fanatic, intent only on his own salvation. Far different and far nobler was the hard simplicity and noble self-denial of the Baptist. It is by no idle fancy that the mediæval painters represent him as emaciated by a proleptic asceticism.[2] The tendency to the life of a recluse had shown itself in the youthful Nazarite from his earliest years; but in him it resulted from the consciousness of a glorious mission — it was from the desire to fulfil a destiny inspired by burning hopes. St. John was a dweller in the wilderness, only that he might thereby become the prophet of the Highest. The light which was within him should be kindled, if need be, into a self-consuming flame, not for his own glory, but that it might illuminate the pathway of the coming King.

The nature of St. John the Baptist was full of impetuosity and fire. The long struggle which had given him so powerful a mastery over himself — which had made him content with self-obliteration before the presence of his Lord — which had inspired him with fearlessness in the face of danger, and humility in the midst of applause — had left its traces in the stern character, and aspect, and teaching of the man. If he had won peace in the long prayer and penitence

[1] Joseph. *Vit.* 2, if the reading παρ' αὐτῷ and not παρ' αὐτοῖς be right.

[2] As, for instance, in a fine picture by Sandro Botticelli in the Borghese Palace at Rome. Compare the early life of St. Benedict of Nursia.

of his life in the wilderness, it was not the spontaneous peace of a placid and holy soul. The victory he had won was still encumbered with traces of the battle; the calm he had attained still echoed with the distant mutter of the storm. His very teaching reflected the imagery of the wilderness — the rock, the serpent, the barren tree. "In his manifestation and agency," it has been said, "he was like a burning torch; his public life was quite an earthquake — the whole man was a sermon; he might well call himself a voice — the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord." [1]

While he was musing the fire burned, and at the last he spake with his tongue. Almost from boyhood he had been a voluntary eremite. In solitude he had learnt things unspeakable; there the unseen world had become to him a reality; there his spirit had caught "a touch of phantasy and flame." Communing with his own great lonely heart — communing with the high thoughts of that long line of prophets, his predecessors to a rebellious people — communing with the utterances that came to him from the voices of the mountain and the sea — he had learnt a deeper lore than he could have ever learnt at Hillel's or Shammai's feet. In the tropic noonday of that deep Jordan valley, where the air seems to be full of a subtle and quivering flame — in listening to the howl of the wild beasts in the long night, under the lustre of stars "that seemed to hang like balls of fire in a purple sky" — in wandering by the sluggish cobalt-colored waters of that dead and accursed lake, until before his eyes, dazzled by the saline efflorescence of the shore strewn with its wrecks of death, the ghosts of the guilty seemed to start out of the sulphurous ashes under which they were submerged — he had learnt a language, he had received a revelation, not vouchsafed to ordinary men — attained, not in the schools of the Rabbis, but in the school of solitude, in the school of God.[2]

Such teachers are suited for such times. There was enough and to spare of those respectable, conventional teachers, who spake smooth things and prophesied deceits. The ordinary Scribe or Pharisee, sleek with good living and

[1] Lange, ii., p. 11, E. Tr.

[2] The Jews of that day had but little sense of the truth expressed by the very greatest of Greek thinkers, Herakleitos, πολυμαθίη νόον οὐ διδάσκει. "Dass aber Jesu auch innerlich der Hohen Schule jener Zeit nicht bedurfte," says Ewald, "zeigt uns nur umso deutlicher welcher Geist von anfang an in Ihm waltete" (*Gesch. Christ.* p. 250. The remarks which follow are also worthy of profound study.)

supercilious with general respect, might get up in the synagogue, with his broad phylacteries and luxurious robes, and might, perhaps, minister to some sleepy edification with his *midrash* of hair-splitting puerilities and threadbare precedents; but the very aspect of John the Baptist would have shown that there was another style of teacher here. Even before the first vibrating tone of a voice that rang with scorn and indignation, the bronzed countenance, the unshorn locks, the close-pressed lips, the leathern girdle, the mantle of camel's hair,[1] would at once betoken that here at last was a man who was a man indeed in all his natural grandeur and dauntless force, and who, like the rough Bedawy prophet who was his antitype, would stand unquailing before purple Ahabs and adulterous Jezebels. And then his life was known. It was known that his drink was water of the river, and that he lived on locusts[2] and wild honey.[3] Men felt in him that power of mastery which is always granted to perfect self-denial. He who is superior to the common ambitions of man is superior also to their common timidities. If he have little to hope from the favor of his fellows he has little to fear from their dislike; with nothing to gain from the administration of servile flattery, he has nothing to lose by the expression of just rebuke. He sits as it were above his brethren, on a sunlit eminence of peace and purity, unblinded by the petty mists that dim their vision, untroubled by the petty influences that disturb their life.

No wonder that such a man at once made himself felt as a power in the midst of his people. It became widely rumored that, in the wilderness of Judæa, lived one whose burning words it was worth while to hear, one who recalled Isaiah by his expressions,[4] Elijah by his life. A Tiberius was polluting by his infamies the throne of the Empire; a Pontius Pilate with his insolences, cruelties, extortions, massacres, was maddening a fanatic people;[5] Herod Antipas was exhibiting to facile learners the example of calculated

[1] Cf. 2 Kings i. 8; Zech. xiii. 4; Heb. xi. 37.

[2] Lev. xi. 22; Plin. ii. 29. The fancy that it means the pods of the so-called locust-tree (carob) is a mistake. Locusts are sold as articles of food in regular shops for the purpose at Medina; they are plunged into salt boiling water, dried in the sun, and eaten with butter, but only by the poorest beggars. Most Bedawin speak of eating them with disgust and loathing (Thomson, *Land and Book*, II. xxviii.).

[3] 1 Sam. xiv. 25; Ps. lxxxi. 16.

[4] Compare Isa. lix. 5 with Matt. iii. 7; Isa. iv. 4 and xliv. 3 with Matt. iii. 11; Isa. xl. 3 with Luke iii. 4; Isa. lii. 10 with Luke iii. 6, etc.

[5] Τὰς δωροδοκίας, τὰς ὕβρεις, τὰς ἁρπαγάς, τὰς εἰκίας, τὰς ἐπηρείας, τοὺς ἀκρίτους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους φόνους, τὴν ἀνήνυτον καὶ ἀργαλεωτάτην ὠμότητα, κ. τ. λ. (Philo, *Leg.* 1033).

apostasy and reckless lust; Caiaphas and Annas were dividing the functions of a priesthood which they disgraced. Yet the talk of the new Prophet was not of political circumstances such as these; the lessons he had to teach were deeper and more universal in their moral and social significance. Whatever might be the class who flocked to his stern solitude, his teaching was intensely practical, painfully heart-searching, fearlessly downright. And so Pharisee and Sadducee, scribe and soldier, priest and publican, all thronged to listen to his words.[1] The place where he preached was that wild range of uncultivated and untenanted wilderness, which stretches southward from Jericho and the fords of Jordan to the shores of the Dead Sea. The cliffs that overhung the narrow defile which led from Jerusalem to Jericho were the haunt of dangerous robbers; the wild beasts and the crocodiles were not yet extinct in the reed-beds that marked the swellings of Jordan; yet from every quarter of the country — from priestly Hebron, from holy Jerusalem, from smiling Galilee — they came streaming forth,[2] to catch the accents of this strange voice. And the words of that voice were like a hammer to dash in pieces the flintiest heart, like a flame to pierce into the most hidden thoughts. Without a shadow of euphemism, without an accent of subservience, without a tremor of hesitation, he rebuked the taxgatherers for their extortionateness; the soldiers for their violence, unfairness, and discontent;[3] the wealthy Sadducees, and stately Pharisees, for a formalism and falsity which made them vipers of a viperous brood.[4] The whole people he warned that their cherished privileges were worse than valueless if, without repentance, they regarded them as a protection against the wrath to come. They prided themselves upon their high descent; but God, as He had created Adam out of the earth, so even out of those flints upon the strand of Jordan was able to raise up children unto Abraham.[5] They listened with accusing con-

[1] But the Pharisees "were not baptized of him" (Luke vii. 30). St. John expresses the frankest and most contemptuous amazement at their presence (Matt. iii. 7). And their brief willingness to listen was soon followed by the violent and summary judgment, "He hath a devil" (Matt. xi. 18). This was not the only age in which such a remark has served as an angry and self-deceiving synonym for "we cannot and will not accept his words."

[2] Matt. iii. 5, ἐξεπορεύετο.

[3] στρατευόμενοι (Luke iii. 14) means "soldiers on the march;" what the occasion was we do not know.

[4] "Offspring of vipers," "Serpentes e serpentibus" (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, in Matt. iii. 7). Cf. Ps. lviii. 4; Isa. xiv. 29.

[5] Cf. John viii. 33; Rom. ii. 28; iv. 16; ix. 6. Comp. Jer. vii. 4. μὴ

THE RIVER JORDAN.

sciences and stricken hearts; and since he had chosen baptism as his symbol of their penitence and purification, "they were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Even those who did not submit to his baptism were yet "willing for a season to rejoice in his light."

But he had another and stranger message — a message sterner, yet more hopeful — to deliver; for himself he would claim no authority save as the forerunner of another; for his own baptism no value, save as an initiation into the kingdom that was at hand.[1] When the deputation from the Sanhedrin asked him who he was — when all the people were musing in their hearts whether he were the Christ or no — he never for a moment hesitated to say that he was not the Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet.[2] He was "a voice in the wilderness," and nothing more; but after him — and this was the announcement that stirred most powerfully the hearts of men — after him was coming One who was preferred before him, for He was before him[3] — One whose shoe's latchet he was unworthy to unloose[4] — One who should baptize, not with water, but with the Holy Ghost, and with fire[5] — One whose fan was in His hand, and who should throughly purge His floor — who should gather His wheat into the garner, but burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. The hour for the sudden coming of their long-promised, long-expected Messiah was at hand. His awful presence was near them, was among them, but they knew Him not.

Thus repentance and the kingdom of heaven were the two cardinal points of his preaching, and though he did not claim the credentials of a single miracle,[6] yet while

ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (Luke iii. 8), "do not even for a moment begin to imagine." "Omnem excusationis etiam *conatum* præcidit" (Bengel).

[1] It was, as Olshausen says, "a baptism of *repentance*," not "a laver of *regeneration*" (Titus iii. 5).

[2] *i.e.*, one of the great prophets like Jeremiah (cf. 2 Macc. ii. 7), whose return was expected as a precursor of the Messiah, and who was especially alluded to in Deut. xviii. 15, 18; Acts iii. 22; vii. 37.

[3] The πρῶτός μου of John i. 30 means something more than merely ἔμπροσθέν μου, viz., "*long* before me." (See Ewald, *Gesch. Christus*, p. 232.)

[4] Or, "to carry his shoes" (Matt. iii. 11). Both were servile functions.

[5] The most immediate and obvious interpretation of these words is to be found in Acts ii. 3; but there may also be a reference to fiery trials (Luke xii. 49; 1 Pet. i. 7) and fiery judgments (1 Cor. iii. 13).

[6] This should be noted as a most powerful argument of the Gospel truthfulness. If, as the schools of modern rationalists argue, the miracles be mere myths woven into a circle of imaginative legends devised to glorify the Founder of Christianity, why was no miracle attributed to St. John? Not certainly from any deficient sense of his greatness nor from any disinclination to accept miraculous evidence. Surely if it were so easy and so

he threatened detection to the hypocrite and destruction to the hardened, he promised also pardon to the penitent and admission into the kingdom of heaven to the pure and clean. "The two great utterances," it has been said, "which he brings from the desert, contain the two capital revelations to which all the preparation of the Gospel has been tending. Law and prophecy; denunciation of sin and promise of pardon; the flame which consumes and the light which consoles — is not this the whole of the covenant?"

To this preaching, to this baptism, in the thirtieth year of his age,[1] came Jesus from Galilee. John was His kinsman by birth,[2] but the circumstances of their life had entirely separated them. John, as a child in the house of the blameless priest his father, had lived at Juttah, in the far south of the tribe of Judah, and not far from Hebron;[3] Jesus had lived in the deep seclusion of the carpenter's shop in the valley of Galilee. When He first came to the banks of the Jordan, the great forerunner, according to his own emphatic and twice repeated testimony, "knew Him not." And yet, though Jesus was not yet revealed as the Messiah to His great herald-prophet, there was something in His look, something in the sinless beauty of His ways, something in the solemn majesty of His aspect, which at once overawed and captivated the soul of John. To others he was the uncompromising prophet; kings he could confront with rebuke; Pharisees he could unmask with indignation; but before this Presence all his lofty bearing falls. As when some unknown dread checks the flight of the eagle, and makes him settle with hushed scream and drooping plumage on the ground, so before "the royalty of inward happiness," before the purity of sinless life, the wild prophet of the desert becomes like a submissive and timid

natural as has been assumed to weave a garland of myth and miracle round the brow of a great teacher, John was conspicuously worthy of such an honor. Why then? because "John did no miracle," and because the Evangelists speak the words of soberness and truth.

[1] The arguments in favor of our Lord's having been fifty years of age, although adopted by Irenæus (*Adv. Haer.* ii. 22), partly apparently from tradition, partly on fanciful grounds, and partly from mistaken inference from John viii. 57, are wholly insufficient to outweigh the distinct statement by St. Luke, and the manifold probabilities of the case.

[2] The relationship between Mary and Elisabeth does not prove that Mary was of the tribe of Levi, since intermarriage between the tribes was freely permitted (2 Chron. xxii. 11).

[3] On Juttah, see Luke i. 39, where the reading Ἰούτα (first suggested by Reland, *Pal.* p. 870), though unconfirmed by any existing MS., is not impossible (Josh. xv. 55); it was a *priestly* city (id. xxi. 16).

child.[1] The battle-brunt which legionaries could not daunt — the lofty manhood before which hierarchs trembled and princes grew pale — resigns itself, submits, adores before a moral force which is weak in every external attribute, and armed only in an invisible mail. John bowed to the simple stainless manhood before he had been inspired to recognize the Divine commission. He earnestly tried to forbid the purpose of Jesus.[2] He who had received the confessions of all others, now reverently and humbly makes his own. "I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?"[3]

The answer contains the second recorded utterance of Jesus, and the first word of His public ministry — "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."

"I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean"[4] — such seems to have been the burden of John's message to the sinners who had become sincerely penitent.

But, if so, why did our Lord receive baptism at His servant's hands? His own words tell us; it was to fulfil every requirement to which God's will might seem to point (Ps. xl. 7, 8). He did not accept it as subsequent to a confession, for He was sinless; and in this respect, even before he recognized Him as the Christ, the Baptist clearly implied that the rite would be in His case exceptional.[5] But he received it as ratifying the mission of His great Forerunner — the last and greatest child of the Old Dispensation, the earliest herald of the New; and He also received it as the beautiful symbol of moral purification, and the humble inauguration of a ministry which came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil. His own words obviate all possibility of misconception. He does not say, "I must," but, "Thus it becometh us." He does not say, "I *have* need to be bap-

[1] Stier beautifully says, "He has baptized many; has seen, and in some sense seen through men of all kinds; but no one like this had as yet come before him. They have all bowed down before him; but before this Man bows down, in the irrepressible emotion of his own most profound contrition, the sinful man in the greatest prophet." (*Reden Jesu*, i. 28.)

[2] Matt. iii. 14, διεκώλυεν.

[3] "*Tu* ad *me*? aurum ad lutum? ad scintillam fax? ad lucernam sol? ad servum Filius? ad peccatorem Agnus sine maculâ?" (Lucas Brugensis.)

[4] Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

[5] ἵνα τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρίσῃ (Ignat. *Eph.* 18). "Baptisatur Christus non ut purificetur aquis, sed ut aquas ipse sanctificet" (Maxim. *Serm.* 7 *de Epiphan.*). "In baptismo *non tam lavit aqua quam lota est*, purgantur potius fluenta quam purgant" (Aug. *Serm.* 135, 4; Hofmann, p. 166).

tized;" nor does He say, "*Thou* hast *no* need to be baptized of me," but He says, "Suffer it to be so now." This is, indeed, but the baptism of repentance; yet it may serve to prefigure the "laver of regeneration."[1]

So Jesus descended into the waters of Jordan, and there the awful sign was given that this was indeed "He that should come." From the cloven[2] heaven streamed the Spirit of God in a dovelike radiance that seemed to hover over His head in lambent flame,[3] and the *Bath Kôl*,[4] which to the dull unpurged ear was but an inarticulate thunder, spake in the voice of God to the ears of John — "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

[1] πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην (Matt. iii. 15) has been sometimes taken to mean "every observance" (cf. vi. 1). Others, as Schenkel, have supposed that He submitted to baptism as it were vicariously — *i.e.*, as the representative of a guilty people. Others, again (as Lange), say that the act was solitary in its character — that "social righteousness drew Him down into the stream;" *i.e.*, that according to the Old Testament legislation, His baptism was required because He was, as it were, ceremonially unclean, as representing an unclean people. Compare the remark of Cato, "Scito dominum pro totâ familiâ rem divinam facere" (*De Re Rusticâ*, 143). Justin Martyr held this view, οὐχ ὡς ἐνδεᾶ . . . ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 88). And so, too, the antiphon of the *Benedictus* in the Romish office for the Epiphany: "This day the Church is united to her heavenly Spouse, for in Jordan Christ has washed away her sins." St. Bernard and St. Bonaventura (and perhaps in myriads of instances the profound intuition of a saint may give a view far more true and lofty than the minute criticism of a theologian) mainly see in the act its deep humility. "Thus placing the confirmation of perfect righteousness in the perfection of humility." (St. Bern. *Serm.* 47 *in Cant.*; St. Bonavent. *Vita Christi*, cap. xiii.)

[2] εἶδε σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανούς (Mark i. 10). The whole context seems to show that Theodoret and Jerome were right in supposing that this was a πνευματικὴ θεωρία — a sight seen, "non reserationе elementorum, sed spiritualibus oculis."

[3] "Spiritus Jesu, spiritus columbinus" (Bacon, *Meditt. Sacr.*). Some ancient Christian mystics explained the appearance by Gematria, because περιστερὰ = 801 = ΑΩ. We need not necessarily suppose an actual dove, as is clear from John i. 32; the expression in the three Gospels is ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν, though St. Luke adds σωματικῷ εἴδει. Compare Targum, Cant. ii. 12, "Vox turturis vox spiritus sancti;" and 2 Esdras v. 26; 1 Macc. i. 2; and Milton's "with mighty wings outspread, *Dovelike*, sat'st brooding on the vast abyss" (*Par. Lost*, i. 20). In the tract *Chagigah*, we find, "The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters like a dove" (Gen. i. 2).

[4] On the *Bath Kôl*, see Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 253, seqq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s.v. The term was sometimes applied to voices from heaven, sometimes to sounds repeated by natural echo, sometimes to chance words overruled to providential significance (Etheridge, *Hebr. Literat.*, p. 39). The Apocryphal Gospels add that a fire was kindled in Jordan (J. Mart. c. *Tryph.* 88; Hofmann, p. 299).

CHAPTER IX.

THE TEMPTATION.

"Ideo tentatus est Christus, ne vincatur a Tentatore Christianus." — Aug. in Ps. lx.

His human spirit filled with overpowering emotions, Jesus sought for retirement, to be alone with God, and once more to think over His mighty work. From the waters of the Jordan He was led — according to the more intense and picturesque expression of St. Mark, He was "driven" — by the spirit into the wilderness.[1]

A tradition, said to be no older than the time of the Crusades, fixes the scene of the temptation at a mountain to the south of Jericho, which from this circumstance has received the name of Quarantania. Naked and arid like a mountain of malediction, rising precipitously from a scorched and desert plain, and looking over the sluggish, bituminous waters of the Sodomitic Sea — thus offering a sharp contrast to the smiling softness of the Mountain of Beatitudes and the limpid crystal of the Lake of Gennesareth — imagination has seen in it a fit place to be the haunt of evil influences [2] — a place where, in the language of the prophets, the owls dwell and the satyrs dance.

[1] Cf. Rom. viii. 14; Ezek. iii. 14; Mark i. 12, τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐκβάλλει αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. St. John, perhaps, among other reasons which are unknown to us, from his general desire to narrate nothing of which he had not been an eye-witness, omits the narrative of the temptation, which clearly followed immediately after the baptism. Unless a charge of dishonesty be deliberately maintained, and an adequate reason for such dishonesty assigned, it is clearly unfair to say that a fact is wilfully *suppressed* simply because it is not narrated. — It seems probable that on the last day of the temptation came the deputation to John from the priests and Levites, and on the following day Christ returned from the desert, and was saluted by the Baptist as the Lamb of God.

[2] *Bab. Erubhin*, f. 19, 1 *a;* Isa. xiii. 21, 22; xxxiv. 14. The Rabbis said that there were three mouths of Gehenna — *in the Desert* (Numb. xvi. 33), in the sea (Jonah ii. 3), and at Jerusalem (Isa. xxxi. 9). Cf. 4 Macc. xviii., οὐ διέφθειρέ με λυμεὼν ἐρημίας, φθορεὺς ἐν πεδίῳ. Azazel (Lev. xvi. 10, Heb.) was a demon of "dry places" (cf. Matt. xii. 43). (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.;* Keim, i. 638.) — Milton's description (*Par. Reg.* iii. 242), probably derived from some authentic source, "would almost seem to have been penned on the spot." (Porter, *Palestine*, i. 185.)

And here Jesus, according to that graphic and pathetic touch of the second Evangelist, "was with the wild beasts." They did not harm him. "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet." So had the voice of olden promise spoken;[1] and in Christ, as in so many of His children, the promise was fulfilled. Those whose timid faith shrinks from all semblance of the miraculous, need find nothing to alarm them here. It is not a natural thing that the wild creatures should attack with ferocity, or fly in terror from, their master man. A poet has sung of a tropical isle that —

> "Nor save for pity was it hard to take
> The helpless life, so wild that it was tame." [2]

The terror or the fury of animals, though continued by hereditary instinct, was begun by cruel and wanton aggression; and historical instances are not wanting in which both have been overcome by the sweetness, the majesty, the gentleness of man. There seems to be no adequate reason for rejecting the unanimous belief of the early centuries that the wild beasts of the Thebaid moved freely and harmlessly among the saintly eremites, and that even the wildest living creatures were tame and gentle to St. Francis of Assisi. Who has not known people whose presence does not scare the birds, and who can approach, without danger, the most savage dog? We may well believe that the mere human spell of a living and sinless personality would go far to keep the Saviour from danger. In the catacombs, and on other ancient monuments of early Christians, He is sometimes represented as Orpheus charming the animals with his song. All that was true and beautiful in the old legends found its fulfilment in Him, and was but a symbol of His life and work.

And he was in the wilderness forty days. The number occurs again and again in Scripture, and always in connection with the facts of temptation or retribution. It is clearly a sacred and representative number, and independently of other associations, it was for forty days that Moses had stayed on Sinai, and Elijah in the wilderness. In moments of intense excitement and overwhelming thought the ordinary needs of the body seem to be modified, or even

[1] Ps. xci. 13. "The beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee" (Job v. 23).

[2] Tennyson's "Enoch Arden."

for a time superseded; and unless we are to understand St. Luke's words, "He did eat nothing," as being absolutely literal, we might suppose that Jesus found all that was necessary for His bare sustenance in such scant fruits as the desert might afford;[1] but however that may be — and it is a question of little importance — at the end of the time He hungered. And this was the tempter's moment. The whole period had been one of moral and spiritual tension.[2] During such high hours of excitement men will sustain, without succumbing, an almost incredible amount of labor, and soldiers will fight through a long day's battle unconscious or oblivious of their wounds. But when the enthusiasm is spent, when the exaltation dies away, when the fire burns low, when Nature, weary and overstrained, reasserts her rights — in a word, when a mighty reaction has begun, which leaves the man suffering, spiritless, exhausted — then is the hour of extreme danger, and that has been, in many a fatal instance, the moment in which a man has fallen a victim to insidious allurement or bold assault. It was at such a moment that the great battle of our Lord against the powers of evil was fought and won.

The struggle was, as is evident, no mere allegory. Into the exact external nature of the temptation it seems at once superfluous and irreverent to enter — superfluous, because it is a question in which any absolute decision is for us impossible; irreverent, because the Evangelists could only have heard it from the lips of Jesus, or of those to whom He communicated it, and our Lord could only have narrated it in the form which conveys at once the truest impression and the most instructive lessons. Almost every different expositor has had a different view as to the agency employed, and the objective or subjective reality of the entire event.[3] From Origen down to Schleiermacher some have regarded it as a vision or allegory — the symbolic description of a purely

[1] The Jewish hermit Banus lived for years on the spontaneous growth of this very desert (Jos. *Vit.* 2). The νηστεύσας of St. Matthew does not necessarily imply an absolute fast.

[2] Luke iv. 2, "Being *forty days tempted* of the devil."

[3] Very few writers in the present day will regard the story of the temptation as a narrative of objective facts. Even Lange gives the story a natural turn, and supposes that the tempter may have acted through the intervention of human agency. Not only Hase and Weisse, but even Olshausen, Neander, Ullmann, and many orthodox commentators, make the details more or less symbolical, and treat it as a profound and eternally significant parable. For a fuller discussion of the subject, see the Excursus "On Different Views of the Temptation" in Ullmann's beautiful treatise on *The Sinlessness of Jesus* (pp. 264–291, third edition, E. Tr.).

inward struggle; and even so literal and orthodox a commentator as Calvin has embraced this view. On this point, which is a matter of mere exegesis, each must hold the view which seems to him most in accordance with the truth; but the one essential point is that the struggle was powerful, personal, intensely real — that Christ, for our sakes, met and conquered the tempter's utmost strength.

The question as to whether Christ was or was not *capable* of sin — to express it in the language of that scholastic and theological region in which it originated, the question as to the peccability or impeccability of His human nature — is one which would never occur to a simple and reverent mind. We believe and know that our blessed Lord was sinless — the Lamb of God, without blemish, and without spot. What can be the possible edification or advantage in the discussion as to whether this sinlessness sprang from a *posse non peccare* or a *non posse peccare*. Some, in a zeal at once intemperate and ignorant, have claimed for Him not only an actual sinlessness, but a nature to which sin was divinely and miraculously impossible. What then? If His great conflict were a mere deceptive phantasmagoria, how can the narrative of it profit us? If *we* have to fight the battle clad in that armor of human free-will which has been hacked and riven about the bosom of our fathers by so many a cruel blow, what comfort is it to us if our great Captain fought not only victoriously, but without real danger; not only uninjured, but without even a possibility of wound? Where is the warrior's courage, if he knows that for him there is but the *semblance* of a battle against the *simulacrum* of a foe? Are we not thus, under an appearance of devotion, robbed of One who, "though he were a son, yet *learned obedience* by the things which he suffered?"[1] Are we not thus, under the guise of orthodoxy, mocked in our belief that we have a High Priest who can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, "being *tempted in all points like as we are*, yet without sin"?[2] They who would *thus* honor Him rob us of our living Christ, who was very man no less than very God, and substitute for Him a perilous Apollinarian phantom enshrined "in the cold empyrean of theology," and alike incapable of kindling devotion, or of inspiring love.

Whether, then, it comes under the form of a pseudo-orthodoxy, false and pharisaical, and eager only to detect or con-

[1] Heb. v. 8. [2] Heb. iv. 15.

demn the supposed heresy of others; or whether it comes from the excess of a dishonoring reverence which has degenerated into the spirit of fear and bondage — let us beware of contradicting the express teaching of the Scriptures, and, as regards this narrative, the express teaching of Christ Himself, by a supposition that He was not liable to real temptation. Nay, He was liable to temptation all the sorer, because it came like agony to a nature infinitely strong yet infinitely pure. In proportion as any one has striven all his life to be, like his great Ensample, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, in that proportion will he realize the intensity of the struggle, the anguish of the antipathy which pervade a nobler nature when, either by suggestions from within or from without, it has been dragged into even apparent proximity to the possibilities of evil. There are few passages in the "Pilgrim's Progress" more powerful, or more suggestive of profound acquaintance with the mysteries of the human heart, than that in which Christian in the Valley of the Shadow of Death finds his mind filled with revolting images and blaspheming words, which have indeed been but whispered into his ear, beyond his own powers of rejection, by an evil spirit, but which, in his dire bewilderment, he cannot distinguish or disentangle from thoughts which are his own, and to which his will consents.[1] In Christ, indeed, we suppose that such special complications would be wholly impossible, not because of any transcendental endowments connected with "immanent divinity" or the "communication of idioms," but because He had lived without yielding to wickedness, whereas in men these illu-

[1] There is something of the same conception in Milton's description of the attempts made by the Evil Spirit to assoil the thoughts of Eve while yet she was innocent: —

> "Him there they found
> Squat like a toad, close at the ear of Eve,
> Assaying by his devilish art to reach
> The organs of her fancy, and with them forge
> Illusions as he list, phantasms and dreams, . . .
> At least distempered, discontented thoughts,
> Vain hopes, vain aims, inordinate desires." — *Par. Lost*, iv. 800.

The passage in the "Pilgrim's Progress" is, "Christian made believe that he spake blasphemies, when it was Satan that suggested them into his mind." It is as follows: — "One thing I would not let slip. I took notice that now poor Christian was so confounded that he did not know his own voice, and thus I perceived it. Just when he was come over against the mouth of the burning pit, one of the wicked ones got behind him, and stepped up softly to him, and whisperingly suggested many grievous blasphemies to him, *which he verily thought had proceeded from his own mind* . . . but he had not the discretion either *to stop his ears, or to know from whence those blasphemies came*."

sions arise in general from their own past sins. They are, in fact, nothing else but the flitting spectres of iniquities forgotten or unforgotten — the mists that reek upward from the stagnant places in the deepest caverns of hearts not yet wholly cleansed. No, in Christ there could not be this terrible inability to discern that which comes from within us and that which is forced upon us from without — between that which the weak will has entertained, or to which, in that ever-shifting border-land which separates thought from action, it has half assented, and that with which it does indeed find itself in immediate contact, but which, nevertheless, it repudiates with every muscle and fibre of its moral being. It must be a weak or a perverted intellect which imagines that "man becomes acquainted with temptation only in proportion as he is defiled by it," or that is unable to discriminate between the severity of a powerful temptation and the stain of a guilty thought. It may sound like a truism, but it is a truism much needed alike for our warnings and our comfort, when the poet who, better than any other has traversed every winding in the labyrinth of the human heart, has told us with such solemnity,

> "'Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus,
> Another thing to fall." [1]

And Jesus was tempted. The "Captain of our salvation" was "made perfect through sufferings." [2] "In that He Himself *hath suffered being tempted*, He is able to succor them that are tempted." [3] The wilderness of Jericho and the Garden of Gethsemane — these witnessed His two most grievous struggles, and in these He triumphed wholly over the worst and most awful assaults of the enemy of souls; but during *no* part of the days of His flesh was He free from temptation, since otherwise His life had been no true human life at all, nor would He in the same measure have left us an ensample that we should follow His steps. "Many other were the occasions," says St. Bonaventura,[4] "on

[1] Shakespeare, "Measure for Measure," ii. 1. Similarly St. Augustine says, "It is the devil's part to suggest, it is ours not to consent;" and St. Gregory, "Sin is first by suggestion, then by delight, and lastly by consent." Luther, says Ullmann, "well distinguishes between *sentire tentationem* and *consentire tentationi*. Unless the tempting impression *be felt*, there is no real temptation; but unless it be *acquiesced in* or *yielded to*, there is no sin" (*ubi supra*, p. 110). "Where then is the point in temptation at which sin begins, or at which it becomes itself sin? it is there where the evil which is presented *to us begins to make a determining impression upon the heart*" (id.).

[2] Heb. ii. 10. [3] Heb. ii. 18. [4] Bonav. *De Vit. Christi*, xiv.

which He endured temptations." "They," says St. Bernard, "who reckon only three temptations of our Lord, show their ignorance of Scripture." [1] He refers to John vii. 1, and Heb. iv. 15; he might have referred still more appositely to the express statement of St. Luke, that when the temptation in the wilderness was over, the foiled tempter left Him indeed, but left Him only "*for a season*," [2] or, as the words may perhaps be rendered, "till a new opportunity occurred." Yet we may well believe that when He rose victorious out of the dark wiles in the wilderness, all subsequent temptations, until the last, floated as lightly over His sinless soul as the cloud-wreath of a summer day floats over the blue heaven which it cannot stain.

1. The exhaustion of a long fast would have acted more powerfully on the frame of Jesus from the circumstance that with Him it was not usual. It was with a gracious purpose that He lived, not as a secluded ascetic in hard and self-inflicted pangs, but as a man with men. Nor does He ever enjoin fasting as a positive obligation, although in two passages He more than sanctions it as a valuable aid (Matt. vi. 16–18; ix. 15).[3] But, in general, we know from His own words that He came "eating and drinking;" practising, not *abstinence*, but *temperance* in all things, joining in the harmless feasts and innocent assemblages of friends, so that His enemies dared to say of Him, "Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber," as of John they said, "He hath a devil." After His fast, therefore, of forty days, however supported by solemn contemplation and supernatural aid, His hunger would be the more severe. And then it was that the tempter came; in what form — whether as a spirit of darkness or as an angel of light, whether under the disguise of a human aspect

[1] Bern. (Serm. xiv. in Ps. "*Qui habitat*"). Vulg. "Militia est vita hominis super terram." See too Theophylact in *Aur. Cat. in Luc.*

[2] Luke iv. 13, ἀχρὶ καιροῦ. Much that I have here said is confirmed by a passage in Greg. M. *Hom.* i. 16 (Wordsw. on Matt. iv. 1), "Tentari Christus potuit, sed ejus mentem peccati delectatio non momordit. Ideo omnis *diabolica illa tentatio foris non intus fuit.*" And yet in spite of these and many more saintly and erudite justifications of such a view from the writings of theologians in all ages, the violent and prejudiced ignorance of modern ἀσοφία still continues to visit all such methods of interpretation with angry anathema and indiscriminate abuse.

[3] Matt. xvii. 21, from which it might seem that Jesus Himself fasted, is omitted by Tischendorf on the authority of ℵ, B, the Cureton Syriac, the Sahidic version, etc. This interpolation arises, however, from Mark ix. 29, where the words of Jesus should also perhaps end at προσευχῇ, and where καὶ νηστείᾳ, though widely sanctioned by the MSS. and versions, are omitted by ℵ, B, K, and rejected by Tischendorf. (When I refer to Tischendorf I mean the readings adopted by him in his *Synopsis Evangelica*, 3d edition, 1871.)

or an immaterial suggestion, we do not know and cannot pretend to say — content to follow simply the Gospel narrative, and to adopt its expressions, not with dry dogmatic assertion as to the impossibility of such expressions being in a greater or less degree allegorical, but with a view only to learn those deep moral lessons which alone concern us, and which alone are capable of an indisputable interpretation.

"If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made loaves." So spake the tempter first. Jesus was hungry, and "these stones" were perhaps those siliceous accretions, sometimes known under the name of *lapides judaici*, which assume the exact shape of little loaves of bread,[1] and which were represented in legend as the petrified fruits of the Cities of the Plain. The pangs of hunger work all the more powerfully when they are stimulated by the added tortures of a quick imagination; and if the conjecture be correct, then the very shape and aspect and traditional origin of these stones would give to the temptation an added force.

There can be no stronger proof of the authenticity and divine origin of this narrative than the profound subtlety and typical universality of each temptation. Not only are they wholly unlike the far cruder and simpler stories of the temptation, in all ages, of those who have been eminent saints, but there is in them a delicacy of insight, an originality of conception, that far transcend the range of the most powerful invention.

It was a temptation to the senses — an appeal to the appetites — an impulse given to that lower nature which man shares with all the animal creation. But so far from coming in any coarse or undisguisedly sensuous form, it came shrouded in a thousand subtle veils. Israel, too, had been humbled, and suffered to hunger in the wilderness, and there, in his extreme need, God had fed him with manna, which was as angels' food and bread from heaven. Why did not the Son of God thus provide Himself with a table in the wilderness? He *could* do so if He liked, and why should He hesitate? If an angel had revealed to the fainting Hagar the fountain of Beer-lahai-roi — if an angel had touched the famishing Elijah, and shown him food — why should *He* await even the ministry of angels to whom such ministry was needless, but whom, if He willed it, angels would have been so glad to serve?

[1] So Matt. iv. 3, ἄρτοι; Luke iv. 3, "that *this* stone become a loaf." Cf. Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 154 (*Elijah's melons*).

How deep is the wisdom of the reply! Referring to the very lesson which the giving of the manna had been designed to teach, and quoting one of the noblest utterances of Old Testament inspiration, our Lord answered, "It standeth written,[1] Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." [2] And what a lesson lies herein for us — a lesson enforced by how great an example — that we are not to be guided by the wants of our lower nature; that we may not misuse that lower nature for the purposes of our own sustenance and enjoyment; that we are not our own, and may not do what we will with that which we imagine to be our own; that even those things which may seem lawful, are yet not all expedient; that man has higher principles of life than material sustenance, as he is a higher existence than his material frame.[3] He who thinks that we live by bread alone, will make the securing of bread the chief object of his life — will determine to have it at whatever cost — will be at once miserable and rebellious if even for a time he be stinted or deprived of it, and, because he seeks no diviner food, will inevitably starve with hunger in the midst of it. But he who knows that man doth *not* live by bread alone, will not thus, for the sake of living, lose all that makes life dear — will, when he has done his duty, trust God to preserve with all things needful the body He has made — will seek with more earnest endeavor the bread from heaven, and that living water whereof he who drinketh shall thirst no more.

And thus His first temptation was analogous in form to the last taunt addressed to Him on the cross — "If Thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross." "*If*" — since faith and trust are the mainstay of all human holiness, the tempter is ever strongest in the suggestion of such doubts; strong, too, in his appeal to the free-will and the self-will of man. "You *may*, you *can* — why not do it?" On the cross our Saviour answers not; here He answers only to express a great eternal principle. He does not say, "I *am* the Son of God;" in the profundity of His humiliation, in the extreme of His self-sacrifice, He made not his equality with God a thing to be grasped at,[4] "but made Himself of no reputation." He foils the tempter, not as very God, but as very man.

[1] Matt. iv. 4. *γέγραπται* — the perfect indicates an abiding, eternal lesson.

[2] Deut. viii. 3. Alford justly draws attention to the fact that Jesus meets and defeats the temptation in His *humanity*; "Man shall not," etc.

[3] "We live by admiration, hope, and love." (Wordsworth.)

[4] Phil. ii. 6, *οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.*

2. The order of the temptations is given differently by St. Matthew and St. Luke, St. Matthew placing second the scene on the pinnacle of the Temple, and St. Luke the vision of the kingdoms of the world. Both orders cannot be right, and possibly St. Luke may have been influenced in his arrangement by the thought that a temptation to spiritual pride and the arbitrary exercise of miraculous power was a subtler and less transparent, and therefore more powerful one, than the temptation to fall down and recognize the power of evil.[1] But the words, "Get thee behind me, Satan," recorded by both Evangelists (Luke iv. 8; Matt. iv. 10) — the fact that St. Matthew alone gives a definite sequence ("then," "again") — perhaps, too, the consideration that St. Matthew, as one of the apostles, is more likely to have heard the narrative immediately from the lips of Christ — give greater weight to the order which he adopts.

Jesus had conquered and rejected the first temptation by the expression of an absolute trust in God. Adapting itself, therefore, with infinite subtlety to the discovered mood of the Saviour's soul, the next temptation challenging as it were directly, and appealing immediately to, this absolute trust, claims the illustration and expression of it, not to relieve an immediate necessity, but to avert an overwhelming peril. "Then he brought Him to the Holy City,[2] and setteth Him on the pinnacle of the Temple."[3] Some well-known

[1] Milton in the "Paradise Regained" may have been influenced to prefer the order as given in St. Luke, partly from this reason, and partly from the supposition that angels rescued our Lord in safety from that dizzy height.

[2] Still called by the Arabs *El-Kûds esh-Shereef*, "the Holy, the Noble."

[3] Matt. iv. 5, ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ. The article is used in both Evangelists, and both times omitted by the English version.

> "So saying, he caught Him up, and without wing
> Of hippogrif, bore through the air sublime,
> Over the wilderness, and o'er the plain,
> Till underneath them fair Jerusalem,
> The Holy City, lifted high her towers,
> And higher yet *the glorious Temple reared*
> *Her pile, far off appearing like a mount*
> *Of alabaster, topt with golden spires.*
> *There, on the highest pinnacle*, he set
> The Son of God." (Milton, *Par. Reg.* iv. 462.)

These journeys through the air (though the sacred narrative says nothing of them, clearly thereby tending to turn our attention wholly from the mere secondary accidents and external form of the story to its inmost meaning) were thoroughly in accordance with ordinary Jewish beliefs (1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16; Acts viii. 39; Ezek. iii. 14). See, too, the apocryphal addition to Habakkuk, and the text interpolated in the Ebionite Gospel of St. Matthew, "My mother the Holy Ghost took me by a hair of the head, and carried me to Mount Tabor." This is quoted by Origen, *in Joann.* t. ii., § 6; and Jer. *in Mic.* vii. 6. The expression "My mother"

pinnacle of that well-known mass must be intended; perhaps the roof of the *Stoa Basilikè*, or Royal Porch, on the southern side of the Temple, which looked down sheer into the valley of the Kidron below it, from a height so dizzy that, according to the description of Josephus, if any one ventured to look down, his head would swim at the immeasurable depth; perhaps Solomon's Porch, the *Stoa Anatolikè*, which Josephus also has described,[1] and from which according to tradition, St. James, the Lord's brother, was afterwards precipitated into the court below.[2]

"If" — again that doubt, as though to awake a spirit of pride, in the exercise of that miraculous display to which He is tempted — "if thou be the Son of God, cast Thyself down." "Thou art in danger not self-sought; save Thyself from it, as Thou canst and mayest, and thereby prove Thy Divine power and nature. Is it not written that the angels shall bear Thee up?[3] Will not this be a splendid proof of Thy trust in God?" Thus deep and subtle was this temptation; and thus, since Jesus had appealed to Scripture, did the devil also "quote Scripture for his purpose." For there was nothing vulgar, nothing selfish, nothing sensuous in this temptation. It was an appeal, not to natural appetites, but to perverted spiritual instincts. Does not the history of sects, and parties, and churches, and men of high religious claims, show us that thousands who could not sink into the slough of sensuality, have yet thrust themselves arrogantly into needless perils, and been dashed into headlong ruin from the pinnacle of spiritual pride? And how calm, yet full of warning, was that simple answer, "It is written again, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'" The word in the original (ἐκπειράσεις — Matt. iv. 7; Deut. vi. 16) is stronger and more expressive. It is, "Thou shalt not *tempt to the extreme* the Lord thy God;" thou shalt not, as it were, presume on all that He can do for thee; thou shalt not claim His miraculous intervention to save thee from thine own presumption and folly; thou shalt not challenge His power to the proof. When thou art in the path of duty trust in Him to the utmost with a perfect confidence; but listen not to that haughty seductive whisper, "Ye shall be

apparently arises from the fact that the Hebrew *ruach* is fem. Jerome (in Isa. xl. 11) tells us that in Ps. lxviii. 12, the Jews explain "maiden" of the soul, and "mistress" of the Holy Spirit.

[1] Jos. *Antt.* xv. 11, § 5, σκοτοδινιᾷν; xx. 9, § 7. See Caspari, p. 256.

[2] Hegesippus *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23; Epiphan. *Adv. Hæres.* xxix. 4.

[3] Ps. xci. 11, 12.

as gods," and let there be no self-willed and capricious irreverence in thy demand for aid. Then — to add the words so cunningly omitted by the tempter — "shalt thou be safe in all thy ways."[1] And Jesus does not even allude to His apparent danger. Danger not self-sought is safety. The tempter's own words had been a confession of his own impotence — "Cast *Thyself* down." Even from that giddy height he had no power to hurl Him whom God kept safe. The Scripture which he had quoted was true, though he had perverted it. No amount of temptation can ever *necessitate* a sin. With every temptation God provides also "*the* way to escape:"

> "Also, it is written,
> 'Tempt not the Lord thy God,' He said, and stood:
> But Satan, smitten by amazement, fell."[2]

3. Foiled in his appeal to natural hunger, or to the possibility of spiritual pride, the tempter appealed to "the last infirmity of noble minds," and staked all on one splendid cast. He makes up for the want of subtlety in the form by the apparent magnificence of the issue. From a high mountain he showed Jesus all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, and as the κοσμοκράτωρ, the "prince of this world," he offered them all to Him who had lived as the village carpenter, in return for one expression of homage, one act of acknowledgment.[3]

"The kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them!" "There are some that will say," says Bishop Andrewes, "that we are never tempted with kingdoms. It may well be, for it needs not be, when less will serve. It was Christ only that was thus tempted; in Him lay an heroical mind that could not be tempted with small matters. But with us it is nothing so, for we esteem more basely of ourselves. We set our wares at a very easy price; he may buy us even

[1] Ps. xci. 11, 12. As the psalm is addressed to "Him that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High," the expression "all thy ways" can only mean ways of innocence and holiness — the ways of God's providence. The only true meaning of the text therefore excludes the insolent gloss put on it by the tempter; and he omits verse 13, which is a prophecy of his own defeat.

[2] *Par. Reg.* iv. 481.

[3] See John xii. 31; xvi. 2–30; Eph. ii. 2 (τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος); 2 Cor. iv. 4; Sar ha-Olam, *Sanhedr.* f. 94. It was done ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου (Luke iv. 5), for, as St. Ambrose says, "in momento praetereunt." We must bear in mind that the Power of Evil has been disarmed to a very great extent in the kingdom of Christ. Samael in the Talmud is called "the prince of the air." The tract *Zohar* goes so far as to call him אֵל אַחֵר (*el âcheer*), "a second god." (See Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 402–420.)

dagger-cheap. He need never carry us so high as the mount. The pinnacle is high enough; yea, the lowest steeple in all the town would serve the turn. Or let him but carry us to the leads and gutters of our own houses; nay, let us but stand in our windows or our doors, if he will give us so much as we can there see, he will tempt us thoroughly; we will accept it, and thank him too. . . . . A matter of half-a-crown, or ten groats, a pair of shoes, or some such trifle, will bring us on our knees to the devil."

But Christ taught, "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

There was one living who, scarcely in a figure, might be said to have the whole world. The Roman Emperor Tiberius was at that moment infinitely the most powerful of living men, the absolute, undisputed, deified ruler of all that was fairest and richest in the kingdoms of the earth. There was no control to his power, no limit to his wealth, no restraint upon his pleasures. And to yield himself still more unreservedly to the boundless self-gratification of a voluptuous luxury, not long after this time he chose for himself a home on one of the loveliest spots on the earth's surface, under the shadow of the slumbering volcano, upon an enchanting islet in one of the most softly delicious climates of the world. What came of it all? He was, as Pliny calls him, "tristissimus ut constat hominum,"[2] "confessedly the most gloomy of mankind." And there, from this home of his hidden infamies, from this island where on a scale so splendid he had tried the experiment of what happiness can be achieved by pressing the world's most absolute authority, and the world's guiltiest indulgences, into the service of an exclusively selfish life, he wrote to his servile and corrupted Senate, "What to write to you, Conscript Fathers, or how to write, or what *not* to write, may all the gods and goddesses destroy me worse than I feel that they are daily destroying me if I know."[1] Rarely has there been vouchsafed to the world a more overwhelming proof that its richest gifts are but "fairy gold that turns to dust and dross," and its most colossal edifices of personal splendor and greatness no more durable barrier against the encroachment of bitter misery

[1] *H. N.* xxviii. 5. For Capreae, see Tac. *Ann.* iv. 61, 62, 67.

[2] "Quid scribam vobis, Patres Conscripti, aut quomodo scribam, aut quid omnino non scribam hoc tempore, di me deaeque pejus perdant quam perire me cotidie sentio si scio. Adeo facinora atque flagitia sua ipsi quoque in supplicium verterant. Quippe Tiberium non fortuna, non solitudines protegebant quin tormenta pectoris suasque ipse poenas fateretur." (Tac. *Ann.* vi. 6.)

than are the babe's sandheaps to stay the mighty march of the Atlantic tide.

In such perplexity, in such anguish, does the sinful possession of all riches and all rule end. Such is the invariable Nemesis of unbridled lusts. It does not need the snaky tresses or the shaken torch of the fabled Erinnyes. The guilty conscience is its own adequate avenger; and "if the world were one entire and perfect chrysolite," and that gem ours, it would not console us for one hour of that inward torment, or compensate in any way for those lacerating pangs.

But he who is an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven is lord over vaster and more real worlds, infinitely happy because infinitely pure. And over that kingdom Satan has no power. It is the kingdom of God; and since from Satan not even the smallest semblance of any of his ruinous gifts can be gained except by suffering the soul to do allegiance to him, the answer to all his temptations is the answer of Christ, "Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'"[1]

Thus was Christ victorious, through that self-renunciation through which only can victory be won. And the moments of such honest struggle crowned with victory are the very sweetest and happiest that the life of man can give. They are full of an elevation and a delight which can only be described in language borrowed from the imagery of heaven.

"Then the devil leaveth Him" — St. Luke adds, "till a fitting opportunity" — "and, behold, angels came and ministered unto Him."[2]

[1] Deut. vi. 13. This being one of St. Matthew's "cyclic" quotations agrees mainly with the LXX. [except προσκυνήσεις for φοβηθήσῃ and μόνῳ, for the LXX. variations are here, no doubt, *altered* in the Alex. MS. from the N. T.], and is not close to the Hebrew; but his "*peculiar*" quotations are usually from the Hebrew, and differ from the LXX. (See Wescott, *Introd.*, p. 211.) It is remarkable that our Lord's three answers are all from Deut. vi. and viii.

[2] The reader will be glad to see, in connection with this subject, some of the remarks of Ullmann, who has studied it more profoundly, and written on it more beautifully, than any other theologian. "The positive temptations of Jesus," he says, "were not confined to that particular point of time when they assailed him with concentrated force. . . . But still more frequently in after life was He called to endure temptation of the other kind — the temptation of suffering, and this culminated on two occasions, viz., in the conflict of Gethsemane, and in that moment of agony on the cross when He cried, '*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*'" (*Sinlessness of Jesus*, E. Tr., p. 140.) He had already remarked (p. 128) that "man is exposed in two ways to the possibility and seductive power of evil. On the one hand he may be drawn to actual sin by enticements;

and, on the other hand, he may be turned aside from good by threatened as well as by inflicted suffering. The former may be termed positive, the latter negative, temptation." "Jesus was tempted in all points — that is, He was tempted in the only two possible ways specified above. On the one hand, allurements were presented which, if successful, would have led Him to actual sin; and, on the other hand, He was beset by sufferings which might have turned him aside from the divine path of duty. These temptations, moreover, occurred both on great occasions and in minute particulars, under the most varied circumstances, from the beginning to the end of His earthly course. But in the midst of them all His spiritual energy and His love to God remained pure and unimpaired" (*id.*, p. 30).

Ewald, in his *Die drei Ersten Evangelien*, regarding the Temptation from the point of view of public work, makes the three temptations correspond severally to the tendencies to (i.) unscrupulousness, (ii.) rash confidence, (iii.) unhallowed personal ambitions.

CHAPTER X.

THE FIRST APOSTLES.

"Nisi habuisset et in vultu quiddam oculisque sidereum nunquam eum statim secuti fuissent Apostoli, nec qui ad comprehendendum eum venerant corruissent." — JER. *Ep.* lxv.

VICTORIOUS over that concentrated temptation, safe from the fiery ordeal, the Saviour left the wilderness and returned to the fords of Jordan.[1]

The Synoptical Gospels, which dwell mainly on the ministry in Galilee, and date its active commencement from the imprisonment of John, omit all record of the intermediate events, and only mention our Lord's retirement to Nazareth.[2] It is to the fourth Evangelist that we owe the beautiful narrative of the days which immediately ensued upon the temptation. The Judæan ministry is brought by him into the first prominence.[3]

[1] It is well known that "Bethania" (א, A, B, C, etc.), not "Bethabara," is the true reading of John i. 28; it was altered by Origen (who admits that it was the reading of nearly all the MSS.) on very insufficient grounds, viz., that no Bethany on the Jordan was known, and that there was *said to be* (δείκνυσθαι δὲ λέγουσι) a Bethabara, where John was said to have baptized. Origen is, however, supported by Cureton's Syriac. The two names (בֵּית עֲבָרָה, "house of passage," and בֵּית אֳנִיָּה, "house of ship," or ferry-boats) have much the same meaning (see 2 Sam. xv. 23, Heb.). Mr. Grove thinks that Bethabara may be identical with Beth-barah, the fords secured by the Ephraimites (Judg. vii. 24), or with Beth-nimrah (Numb. xxxii. 36). This latter answers to the description, being close to the region round about Jordan, the *Ciccar* of the O. T., the oasis of Jericho. In some edd. of the LXX. this is actually written Βηθαβρά (*Bibl. Dict.* i. 204). Mr. Monro ingeniously suggests that Origen (like his copyists) may have confused Bethabara with Betharaba (Josh. xviii. 22) which was in the Jordan valley. After careful attention, I see no grounds whatever for agreeing with Caspari (*Chron. Geogr. Einl.* 227) and others who place this Bethania at Tellanihje, on the upper Jordan, to the northeast of the Sea of Gennesareth. The reasons for the traditional scene of the baptism, near Jericho, and therefore within easy reach of Jerusalem, seem far more convincing. [The Bethany in the Mount of Olives has another derivation; it was usually derived from בֵּית תְּאֵנִי, "house of unripe dates;" but after the valuable letter from Dr. Deutsch, published by Mr. W. H. Dixon in his *Holy Land* (ii. 217), this conjecture of Lightfoot's must remain at least doubtful.]

[2] Matt. iv. 12 (ἀνεχώρησεν, "withdrew"); Mark i. 14; Luke iv. 14.

[3] Throughout this book it will be seen that I accept unhesitatingly the genuineness of St. John's Gospel. It would be of course impossible, and is no part of my purpose, to enter fully into the controversy about it; and

He seems to have made a point of relating nothing of which he had not been a personal witness, and there are some few indications that he was bound to Jerusalem by peculiar relations.[1] By station St. John was a fisherman, and it is not

it is the more needless, because in many books of easy access (I may mention, among others, Professor Westcott's *Introd. to the Study of the Gospels*, and *Hist. of the Canon of the New Testament*, and Mr. Sanday's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*) the main arguments which seem decisive in favor of its genuineness may be studied by any one. The other side is powerfully argued by Mr. Tayler in his *Fourth Gospel*. All that I need here say (referring especially to what Professor Westcott has written on the subject), is, that there is *external* evidence for its authenticity in the allusions to or *traces of the influence* of this Gospel in Ignatius and Polycarp; and later in the second century, of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus, etc. Papias does not indeed mention it, which is a circumstance difficult to account for; but according to Eusebius (*Hist. Ecc.* iii. 39), he "made use of testimonies" out of the First Epistles, and few will separate the question of the genuineness of the Epistles from that of the genuineness of the Gospel. The very slightness of the Second and Third Epistles is almost a convincing proof of their authenticity, since no one could have dreamed of forging them. The early admission of the Fourth Gospel into the canon both of the East and West, and the acknowledgment of it even by heretics, are additional arguments in its favor. Dr. Lightfoot also notices the further fact that "soon after the middle of the second century divergent readings of a striking kind occur in St. John's Gospel, as for instance, *μονογενὴς θεὸς* and *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς*" (i. 18), and this leads us to the conclusion "that the text has already a history, and that the Gospel therefore cannot have been very recent" (*On Revision*, p. 20). But if the external evidence, though less *decisive* than we could have desired, is not inadequate, the internal evidence, derived not only from its entire scope, but also from numberless minute and incidental particulars, is simply overwhelming; and the improbabilities involved in the hypothesis of forgery are so immense, that it is hardly too much to say that we should have recognized in the Gospel the authorship of St. John, even if it had come down to us anonymously, or under some other name. The Hebraic coloring of the style; the traces of distinctly Judaic training and conceptions (i. 45; iv. 22); the naïve faithfulness in admitting facts which might seem to tell most powerfully against the writer's belief (vii. 5); the minute topographical and personal allusions and reminiscences (vi. 10, 19, 23; x. 22, 23; xi. 1, 44, 54; xxi. 2); the faint traces that the writer had been a disciple of John the Baptist, whose title he alone omits (i. 15; iii. 23, 25); the vivid freshness of the style throughout, as, for instance, in the account of the blind man, and of the Last Supper — so wholly unlike a philosopheme, and so clearly written *ad narrandum*, not *ad probandum* (ch. ix., xiii.); the preservation of the remarkable fact that Jesus was first tried before Annas (xviii. 13, 19–24), and the correction of the current tradition as to the time of the Last Supper (xiii. 1; xviii. 28); — these are but a few of numberless internal evidences which bring additional confirmation to the conviction inspired by the character and contents of this great Gospel. They have left no doubt on the minds of many profound and competent scholars, and no one can easily make light of evidence which has satisfied such a philologian as Ewald, and, for twelve editions of his book, satisfied even such a critic as Renan. It is my sincere belief that the difficulties of accepting the Gospel are mainly superficial, and that they are infinitely less formidable than those involved in its rejection. Mr. Sanday has treated the question with great impartiality; and in his volume many of the points touched upon in this note are developed with much force and skill.

[1] John xix. 27; xviii. 16. Perhaps this explains the fact that James was not with his brother John as a disciple of the Baptist. Andrew, on

impossible that, as the fish of the Lake of Galilee were sent in large quantities to Jerusalem, he may have lived there at certain seasons in connection with the employment of his father and his brother, who, as the owners of their own boat and the masters of hired servants, evidently occupied a position of some importance. Be that it may, it is St. John alone who narrates to us the first call of the earliest Apostles, and he relates it with all the minute particulars and graphic touches of one on whose heart and memory each incident had been indelibly impressed.

The deputation of the Sanhedrin [1] (to which we have already alluded) seems to have taken place the day previous to our Lord's return from the wilderness; and when, on the following morning,[2] the Baptist saw Jesus approaching, he delivered a public and emphatic testimony that this was indeed the Messiah who had been marked out to him by the appointed sign, and that He was "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Whether the prominent conception in the Baptist's mind was the Pascal Lamb, or the Lamb of the morning and evening sacrifice; whether "the world" (κόσμος) was the actual expression which he used, or is merely a Greek rendering of the word "people" (עם); whether he understood the profound and awful import of his own utterance, or was carried by prophetic inspiration beyond himself — we cannot tell. But this much is clear, that since his whole imagery, and indeed the very description of his own function and position, is, as we have already seen, borrowed from the Evangelical prophet, he must have used the expression with distinct reference to the picture of Divine patience and mediatorial suffering in Isa. liii. 7 (cf. Jer. xi. 19). His words could hardly have involved less meaning than this — that the gentle and sinless man to whom he pointed should be a man of sorrows, and that these sorrows should be for the salvation of His race.[3] Whatever else the

finding Christ, immediately sought out his brother Simon. John could not do so, for his brother was in Galilee, and was not called till some time subsequently.

[1] John i. 19–34. See p. 99.

[2] John i. 35–43. The οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτὸν means that the Baptist did not recognize Jesus as the Messiah, till he had seen (τεθέαμαι, ver. 32; ἑώρακα ver. 34) the heavenly sign.

[3] "He felt in the delicacy of Christ's personality all its capability of suffering, and its suffering destiny." (Lange, ii. 283. Comp. Exod. xii. 5; 1 Cor. v. 7; 1 Pet. i. 19.) In the Apocalypse (v. 6; vii. 9, etc.) ἀρνίον, not ἀμνός, is always used. The attempt of Danz to account for the expression as a mistaken rendering of עַמְנוּאֵל in the sense of "strong hero" (see Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 101) is only worth noticing as an instance of that fondness

words may have connoted to the minds of his hearers, yet they could hardly have thought them over without connecting Jesus with the conceptions of sinlessness, of suffering, and of a redeeming work.

Memorable as this testimony was, it seems on the first day to have produced no immediate result. But on the second day, when the Baptist was standing accompanied by two of his disciples, Jesus again walked by, and John, fixing upon Him his intense and earnest gaze,[1] exclaimed again, as though with involuntary awe and admiration, "Behold the Lamb of God!"

The words were too remarkable to be again neglected, and the two Galilæan youths who heard them followed the retreating figure of Jesus. He caught the sound of their timid footsteps, and turning round to look at them as they came near, He gently asked, "What seek ye?"

It was but the very beginning of His ministry: as yet they could not know Him for all that He was;[2] as yet they had not heard the gracious words that proceeded out of His lips; in coming to seek Him thus they might be actuated by inadequate motives, or even by mere passing curiosity; it was fit that they should come to Him by spontaneous impulse and declare their object of their own free will.

But how deep and full of meaning is that question, and how sternly it behooves all who come to their Lord to answer it! One of the holiest of the Church's saints, St. Bernard, was in the habit of constantly warning himself by the solemn query, "*Bernarde, ad quid venisti?*"—"Bernard, for what purpose art thou here?" Self-examination could assume no more searching form; but all the meaning which it involved was concentrated in that quiet and simple question, "What seek ye?"

It was more than the two young Galilæans could answer Him at once; it meant more perhaps than they knew or understood, yet the answer showed that they were in earnest. "Rabbi," they said (and the title of profound honor and rever-

for ingenious novelties which is the bane of German theologians. On the word αἴρων, "bearing, and carrying away," "expiating," cf. Exod. xxviii. 30; xxxiv. 7; Lev. v. 1, etc.

[1] ἐμβλέψας. For other instances of the word, see Matt. xix. 26; Luke xx. 17; Mark x. 21.

[2] Even if, as some suppose, St. John the Evangelist was His first cousin. The argument for supposing that Salome, the wife of Zebedee, was a sister of the Virgin Mary, arises from the comparison of Mark xv. 40 with John xix. 25, where *four* women are mentioned; but John, with his usual delicate reserve, does not mention his own mother by name. See *sup.*, p. 89, *n.* 3.

ence[1] showed how deeply His presence had impressed them), "where art thou staying?"

Where it was we do not know. Perhaps in one of the temporary *succôth*, or booths, covered at the top with the striped *abba*, which is in the East an article of ordinary wear, and with their wattled sides interwoven with green branches of terebinth or palm, which must have given the only shelter possible to the hundreds who had flocked to John's baptism. "He saith to them, 'Come and see.'" Again, the words were very simple, though they occur in passages of much significance.[2] Never, however, did they produce a result more remarkable than now. They came and saw where Jesus dwelt, and as it was then four in the afternoon,[3] stayed there that day, and probably slept there that night; and before they lay down to sleep they knew and felt in their inmost hearts that the kingdom of heaven had come, that the hopes of long centuries were now fulfilled, that they had been in the presence of Him who was the desire of all nations, the Priest greater than Aaron, the Prophet greater than Moses, the King greater than David, the true Star of Jacob and Sceptre of Israel.

One of those two youths who thus came earliest to Christ was Andrew.[4] The other suppressed his own name because he was the narrator, the beloved disciple, the Evangelist St. John.[5] No wonder that the smallest details, down even to the very hour of the day, were treasured in his memory, never to be forgotten, even in extreme old age.

[1] Among the Jews this title was a sort of degree. One of the myriads of idle conjectures which have defaced the simple narrative of the Gospels is that Jesus had taken this degree among the Essenes. It is clear, on the one hand, that He never sought it; and on the other, that it was bestowed upon Him even by the most eminent Pharisees (John iii. 2) out of spontaneous and genuine awe.

[2] John xi. 34; Cant. iii. 11; Rev. vi. 1, 3, 5, 7; Ps. lxvi. 5, etc. (see Stier, i. 51).

[3] The tenth hour counting from six in the morning; there is no ground for supposing, with Wieseler, that John counts from midnight, instead of adopting the ordinary Jewish computation (John iv. 6, 52; xi. 9; xix. 14). Wieseler seems even to be mistaken in the belief that the Romans ever counted the *hours* of their civil day from midnight. — Mr. Monro refers me to a passage of the *Digests* in which *hora vi. diei* and *hora vi. noctis* are referred to in the very sentence in which a lawyer is expounding civil computation in opposition to natural. (Dig. xli., tit. 3, fr. 6, 7.)

[4] Hence the Fathers call him ὁ πρωτόκλητος.

[5] This exquisite and consistent reticence is one of the many strong arguments in favor of the genuineness of the Gospel. If our view be right, he *did* care about the facts of which he is writing, but did not care that his mere name should be remembered among men. M. Renan seems at one time to have held that it was partly written out of jealousy at the primacy popularly ascribed to St. Peter!

It was the first care of Andrew to find his brother Simon, and tell him of this great Eureka.[1] He brought him to Jesus, and Jesus, looking earnestly on him with that royal gaze which read intuitively the inmost thoughts — seeing at a glance in that simple fisherman all the weakness but also all the splendid greatness of the man — said, giving him a new name, which was long afterwards yet more solemnly confirmed, "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Kephas;" that is, "Thou art Simon, the son of the *dove;* hereafter thou shalt be as the rock in which the dove hides."[2] It was, indeed, a play upon the word, but one which was memorably symbolic and profound. None but the shallow and the ignorant will see, in such a play upon the name, anything derogatory to the Saviour's dignity. The essential meaning and augury of names had been in all ages a belief among the Jews, whose very language was regarded by themselves as being no less sacred than the oracular gems on Aaron's breast. Their belief in the mystic potency of sounds, of the tongue guided by unalterable destiny in the realms of seeming chance, may seem idle and superstitious to an artificial cultivation, but has been shared by many of the deepest thinkers in every age.[3]

How was it that these youths of Galilee, how was it that a John so fervid yet contemplative, a Peter so impetuous in his affections yet so timid in his resolves, were thus brought at once — brought, as it were, by a single look, by a single word — to the Saviour's feet? How came they thus, by one flash of insight or of inspiration, to recognize, in the carpenter of Nazareth, the Messiah of prophecy, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world?

Doubtless in part by what He said, and by what John the Baptist had testified concerning Him, but doubtless also in

[1] Εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν (John i. 42). (Pressensé, *Jésus Christ*, p. 294.) This was indeed a true act of brotherly affection. (See Keble's Hymn on St. Andrew's Day.) It is strange that no one should have alluded (so far as I have seen) to the reason why St. John could not then perform for his brother the same great service. The reason probably is that James was at the time quietly pursuing his calling by the Sea of Galilee.

[2] Lange, ii. 284. Or possibly, "Thou art a Son of Weakness, but shalt become a Rock." Unfortunately, however, there is no sufficient authority for giving this meaning to the word כֵּיפָא. (Lücke, i. 450.)

[3] Cf. Æsch. *Agam.* 665, προνοίαισι τοῦ πεπρωμένου γλῶσσαν ἐν τύχᾳ νέμων. (See *Origin of Lang.*, ch. iii.; *Chapters on Lang.*, pp. 269–277.) I am not now referring to such recondite fancies as those involved in the Cabalistic modes of interpretation by *Gematria, notarikon, atbash*, etc., but to something far more antique and spontaneous, of which, for instance, we find specimens not only in the tragedians, but even in the stories of Herodotus (ix. 91, etc.).

part by His very look. On this subject, indeed, tradition has varied in a most remarkable manner; but on a point of so much interest we may briefly pause.

Any one who has studied the representations of Christ in mediæval art will have observed that some of them, particularly in missals, are degradingly and repulsively hideous, while others are conceived in the softest and loveliest ideal of human beauty.[1] Whence came this singular divergence?

It came from the prophetic passages which were supposed to indicate the appearance of the Messiah, as well as His life.

The early Church, accustomed to the exquisite perfection of form in which the genius of heathen sculpture had clothed its conceptions of the younger gods of Olympus — aware, too, of the fatal corruptions of a sensual imagination — seemed to find a pleasure in breaking loose from this adoration of personal endowments, and in taking as their ideal of the bodily aspect of our Lord, Isaiah's picture of a patient and afflicted sufferer, or David's pathetic description of a smitten and wasted outcast.[2] His beauty, says Clemens of Alexandria, was in His soul and in His actions, but in appearance He was base. Justin Martyr describes Him as being without beauty, without glory, without honor. His body, says Origen, was small, and ill-shapen, and ignoble. "His body," says Tertullian, "had no human handsomeness, much less any celestial splendor." The heathen Celsus, as we learn from Origen, even argued from His traditional meanness and ugliness of aspect as a ground for rejecting His divine origin.[3] Nay, this kind of distorted inference went to even greater extremities. The Vulgate rendering of Isa. liii. 4 is, "*Nos putavimus eum* QUASI LEPROSUM, *percussum a Deo et humiliatum;*" and this gave rise to a wide-spread fancy, of which there are many traces, that He who healed so many leprosies was Himself a leper![4]

[1] See Lecky, *Hist. of Rationalism*, i. 257.

[2] Isa. lii. 14; liii. 4, "We did esteem him *stricken* (נָגוּעַ; cf. מְנֻגָּע, Lev. xiii. 13), smitten of God, and afflicted." Ps. xxii. 6, 7, "I am a worm, and no man. . . . All they that see me laugh me to scorn;" 15–17, "My strength is dried up like a potsherd. . . . I may tell all my bones; they stand staring and looking upon me."

[3] See Keim, i. 460, who quotes Just. Mart. c. *Tryph.* xiv. 36, etc., ἀειδὴς, ἄδοξος, ἄτιμος; Clem *Strom.* ii. 440, *Paed.* iii. 1, 3, τὴν ὄψιν αἰσχρὸς; Tert. *De Car. Christ.* 9, "Nec humanae honestatis corpus fuit, nedum caelestis claritatis;" Orig. c. *Cels.* vi. 75, τὸ σῶμα μικρὸν καὶ δυσειδὲς καὶ ἀγενὲς ἦν.

[4] In the Talmud *Cod. Sanhedrin*, to the question, "What is the name of the Messias?" it is answered "*The Leper.*" (Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. iv. See the story of St. Francis in Sir J. Stephen's *Essays on Eccles. Biog.* i.

Shocked, on the other hand, by these revolting fancies, there were many who held that Jesus, in His earthly features, reflected the charm and beauty of David, His great ancestor; and St. Jerome and St. Augustine preferred to apply to Him the words of Psalm xlv. 2, 3, "Thou art fairer than the children of men."[1] It was natural that, in the absence of positive indications, this view should command a deeper sympathy, and it gave rise both to the current descriptions of Christ, and also to those ideals, so full of mingled majesty and tenderness in —

> "That face
> How beautiful, if sorrow had not made
> Sorrow more beautiful than beauty's self,"

which we see in the great pictures of Fra Angelico, of Michael Angelo, of Leonardo da Vinci, of Raphael, and of Titian.[2]

Independently of all tradition, we may believe with reverent conviction that there could have been nothing mean or repugnant — that there must, as St. Jerome says, have been "something starry" — in the form which enshrined an Eternal Divinity and an Infinite Holiness. All true beauty is but "the sacrament of goodness," and a conscience so stainless, a spirit so full of harmony, a life so purely noble, could not but express itself in the bearing, could not but be reflected in the face, of the Son of Man. We do not indeed find any allusion to this charm of aspect, as we do in the description of the young High-priest Aristobulus whom Herod murdered; but neither, on the other hand, do we find in the language of His enemies a single word or allusion which might have been founded on an unworthy appearance. He of whom John bore witness as the Christ — He whom the multitude would gladly have seized that He might be their king — He whom the city saluted with triumphal shouts as the Son of David — He to whom women ministered with such deep devotion, and whose aspect, even in the troubled images of a dream, had inspired a Roman lady with interest and awe — He whose

99; Montalembert, *St. Eliz. de Hongrie*, ii. 93–99, in both of which stories Christ appears as a leper.) Hence the extraordinary devotion bestowed on this afflicted class by St. Edmund of Canterbury, St. Louis, St. James de Chantal, etc. In fact, leprosy came to be regarded as a gift of God. In 1541 Henry, organist of Coblenz, begged the council of the city to give a place in the hospital to his son. "Somit dem Us-satz von Gott dem almechtigen begabt." In 1189 Clement III. addressed a bull "dilectis filiis leprosis."

[1] Aug. *in Ep. Joh.*, tract. ix. 9.

[2] See Excursus VI., "Traditional Descriptions of the Appearance of Our Lord."

mere word caused Philip and Matthew and many others to leave all and follow Him — He whose one glance broke into an agony of repentance the heart of Peter — He before whose presence those possessed with devils were alternately agitated into frenzy and calmed into repose, and at whose question, in the very crisis of His weakness and betrayal, His most savage enemies shrank and fell prostrate in the moment of their most infuriated wrath[1] — such an One as this could not have been without the personal majesty of a Prophet and a Priest. All the facts of His life speak convincingly of that strength, and endurance, and dignity, and electric influence, which none could have exercised without a large share of human, no less than of spiritual, gifts. "Certainly," says St. Jerome, "a flame of fire and starry brightness flashed from His eye, and the majesty of the Godhead shone in His face."

The third day after the return from the wilderness seems to have been spent by Jesus in intercourse with his new disciples. On the fourth day He wished to start[2] for his return to Galilee, and on the journey fell in with another young fisherman, Philip of Bethsaida. Alone of the Apostles Philip had a Greek name, derived, perhaps, from the tetrarch Philip, since the custom of naming children after reigning princes has always been a common one.[3] If so, he must at this time have been under thirty. Possibly his Greek name indicates his familiarity with some of the Greek-speaking population who lived mingled with the Galilæans on the shores of Gennesareth; and this may account for the fact that he, rather than any of the other Apostles, was appealed to by the Greeks who, in the last week of His life, wished to see our Lord. One word — the one pregnant invitation, "*Follow me!*" — was sufficient to attach to Jesus for ever the gentle and simple-minded Apostle, whom in all probability He had previously known.

The next day a fifth neophyte was added to that sacred and happy band. Eager to communicate the rich discovery which he had made, Philip sought out his friend Nathanael,

[1] John xviii. 6. Cf. Luke iv. 30.

[2] In using the phrase ἠθέλησεν ἐξελθεῖν, it is evident that St. John had in his mind some slight circumstance unknown to us.

[3] The name Andrew is of Greek origin, but Lightfoot (*Harmony*, Luke v. 10) shows that it was in use among the Jews. Thomas was also called by the Greek name Didymus, or "Twin;" but we know no name of Philip except this Greek one. The ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδας probably means "a native of," for Greswell's attempt to distinguish ἀπὸ from ἐκ in this sense is untenable.

exercising thereby the divinest prerogative of friendship, which consists in the communication to others of all that we have ourselves experienced to be most divine. Nathanael, in the list of Apostles, is generally, and almost indubitably, identified with Bartholomew; for Bartholomew is less a name than a designation — "*Bar-Tolmai*, the son of Tolmai;" and while Nathanael is only in one other place mentioned under this name (John xxi. 2), Bartholomew (of whom, on any other supposition, we should know nothing whatever) is, in the list of Apostles, almost invariably associated with Philip.[1] As his home was at Cana of Galilee, the son of Tolmai might easily have become acquainted with the young fisherman of Gennesareth. And yet so deep was the retirement in which up to this time Jesus had lived His life, that though Nathanael knew Philip, he knew nothing of Christ. The simple mind of Philip seemed to find a pleasure in contrasting the grandeur of His office with the meanness of His birth: "We have found Him of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, did write;" whom think you? — a young Herodian prince? — a young Asmonæan priest? — some burning light from the schools of Shammai or Hillel? — some passionate young Emîr from the followers of Judas of Gamala? — no, but "*Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.*"

Nathanael seems to have felt the contrast. He caught at the local designation. It may be, as legend says, that he was a man of higher position than the rest of the Apostles.[2] It has been usually considered that his answer was proverbial; but perhaps it was a passing allusion to the word *nazora*, "despicable;" or it may merely have implied "*Nazareth*, that obscure and ill-reputed town in its little untrodden valley — can anything good come from *thence?*" The answer is in the same words which our Lord had addressed to John and Andrew. Philip was an apt scholar, and he too said, "*Come and see.*"

To-day, too, that question — "*Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?*" — is often repeated, and the one sufficient answer — almost the only possible answer — is now, as it then was, "*Come and see.*" Then it meant, come and see One who spake as never man spake; come and see One

[1] Some make Tolmai a mere abbreviation of Ptolomæus. On the identity of Nathanael with Bartholomew, see Ewald, *Gesch. Christus*, 327. Donaldson (*Jashar*, p. 9) thinks that Nathanael was Philip's brother.

[2] "Non Petro vili piscatori *Bartholomæus nobilis* anteponitur" (Jerome *Ep. ad Eustoch.*). Hence he is usually represented in mediæval art clothed in a purple mantle, adorned with precious stones; but John xxi. 2 is alone sufficient to invalidate the tradition.

who, though He be but the Carpenter of Nazareth, yet overawes the soul of all who approach Him — seeming by His mere presence to reveal the secrets of all hearts, yet drawing to Him even the most sinful with a sense of yearning love; come and see One from whom there seems to breathe forth the irresistible charm of a sinless purity, the unapproachable beauty of a Divine life. "Come and see," said Philip, convinced in his simple faithful heart that to see Jesus was to know Him, and to know was to love, and to love was to adore. In this sense, indeed, we can say "Come and see" no longer; for since the blue heavens closed on the visions which were vouchsafed to St. Stephen and St. Paul, His earthly form has been visible no more. But there is another sense, no less powerful for conviction, in which it still suffices to say, in answer to all doubts, "Come and see." Come and see a dying world revivified, a decrepit world regenerated, an aged world rejuvenescent; come and see the darkness illuminated, the despair dispelled; come and see tenderness brought into the cell of the imprisoned felon, and liberty to the fettered slave; come and see the poor, and the ignorant, and the many, emancipated for ever from the intolerable thraldom of the rich, the learned, and the few; come and see hospitals and orphanages rising in their permanent mercy beside the crumbling ruins of colossal amphitheatres which once reeked with human blood; come and see the obscene symbols of an universal degradation obliterated indignantly from the purified abodes; come and see the dens of lust and tyranny transformed into sweet and happy homes, defiant atheists into believing Christians, rebels into children, and pagans into saints. Ay, come and see the majestic acts of one great drama continued through nineteen Christian centuries; and as you see them all tending to one great development, long predetermined in the Council of the Divine Will — as you learn in reverent humility that even apparent Chance is in reality *the daughter of Forethought*, as well as, for those who thus recognize her nature, *the sister of Order and Persuasion*[1] — as you hear the voice of your Saviour searching, with the loving accents of a compassion which will

[1] [Τύχα] Εὐνομίας τε καὶ Πειθοῦς ἀδελφὰ καὶ Προμαθείας θυγάτηρ (Alcman, f. 55, ed. Bergk.). "The threefold offspring of Forethought which is described in this noble fragment, appears to represent three of the cardinal relations in which we may regard the working of Providence. It first appears as Chance in regard to its occurrence; it next works Persuasion as men bow to its decrees; and at last it issues in Order" (Westcott, *Charact. of the Gosp. Miracles*, p. 35).

neither strive nor cry, your very reins and heart — it may be that you too will unlearn the misery of doubt, and exclaim in calm and happy confidence, with the pure and candid Nathanael, "*Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.*"

The fastidious reluctance of Nathanael was very soon dispelled. Jesus, as He saw him coming, recognized that the seal of God was upon his forehead, and said of him, "Behold a true Israelite, in whom guile is not." "Whence dost thou recognize me?" asked Nathanael; and then came that heart-searching answer, "Before that Philip called thee, whilst thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee."

It was the custom of pious Jews — a custom approved by the Talmud — to study their *crishma*, or office of daily prayer, under a fig-tree;[1] and some have imagined that there is something significant in the fact of the Apostle having been summoned from the shade of a tree which symbolized Jewish ordinances and Jewish traditions, but which was beginning already to cumber the ground.[2] But though something interesting and instructive may often be derived from the poetic insight of a chastened imagination which can thus observe allegories which lie involved in the simplest facts, yet no such flash of sudden perception could alone have accounted for the agitated intensity of Nathanael's reply. Every one must have been struck, at first sight, with the apparent disproportionateness between the cause and the effect. How apparently inadequate was that quiet allusion to the lonely session of silent thought under the fig-tree, to produce the instantaneous adhesion, the henceforth inalienable loyalty, of this "fusile Apostle" to the Son of God, the King of Israel! But for the true explanation of this instantaneity of conviction, we must look deeper; and then, if I mistake not, we shall see in this incident another of those indescribable touches of reality which have been to so many powerful minds the most irresistible internal evidence to establish the historic truthfulness of the Fourth Gospel.

There are moments when the grace of God stirs sensibly in the human heart; when the soul seems to rise upon the eagle-wings of hope and prayer into the heaven of heavens; when caught up, as it were, into God's very presence, we see

[1] *Beresh. Rabba*, f. 62, quoted by Sepp. The accusative, ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν, where we should have expected the dative, seems to imply that he had *purposely gone there* for prayer and meditation. Perhaps some inference as to the time of year may be drawn from this circumstance.

[2] See 1 Kings iv. 25; Mic. iv. 4; Zech. iii. 10; Matt. xxi. 20; Luke xiii. 7.

and hear things unspeakable. At such moments we live a lifetime; for emotions such as these annihilate all time; they —

> "Crowd Eternity into an hour,
> Or stretch an hour into Eternity."

At such moments we are nearer to God; we seem to know Him and be known of Him; and if it were possible for any man at such a moment to see into our souls, he would know all that is greatest and most immortal in our beings. But to see us then is impossible to man; it is possible only to Him whose hand should lead, whose right hand should guide us, even if we could take the wings of the morning and fly into the uttermost parts of the sea. And such a crisis of emotion must the guileless Israelite have known as he sat and prayed and mused in silence under his fig-tree. To the consciousness of such a crisis — a crisis which could only be known to One to whom it was given to read the very secrets of the heart — our Lord appealed. Let him who has had a similar experience say how he would regard a living man who could reveal to him that he had at such a moment looked into and fathomed the emotions of his heart. That such solitary musings — such penetrating, even in this life, "behind the veil" — such raptures into the third heaven during which the soul strives to transcend the limitations of space and time while it communes, face to face, with the Eternal and the Unseen — such sudden kindlings of celestial lightning which seemed to have fused all that is meanest and basest within us in an instant and for ever — that these supreme crises *are* among the recorded experiences of the Christian life, rests upon indisputable evidence of testimony and of fact. And if any one of my readers has ever known this spasm of divine change which annihilates the old and in the same moment creates or re-creates a new-born soul, such a one, at least, will understand the thrill of electric sympathy, the arrow-point of intense conviction, that shot that very instant through the heart of Nathanael, and brought him, as it were, at once upon his knees with the exclamation, "*Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel!*"

We scarcely hear of Nathanael again. His seems to have been one of those calm, retiring, contemplative souls, whose whole sphere of existence lies not here, but —

> "Where, beyond these voices, there is peace."

CANA OF GALILEE.

It was a life of which the world sees nothing, because it was "*hid* with Christ in God;" but of this we may be sure, that never till the day of his martyrdom, or even during his martyr agonies, did he forget those quiet words which showed that his "Lord had searched him out and known him, and comprehended his thoughts long before." Not once, doubtless, but on many and many a future day,[1] was the promise fulfilled for him and for his companions, that, with the eye of faith, they should see the heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."[2]

[1] ὄψεσθε (א, B, L, etc.). The promise is obviously spiritual, as the ablest Fathers saw. A striking passage of Luther's to this effect is quoted in Alford. The word "*hereafter* shall ye see," etc. (John i. 51), meant "*from this time forth*," and therefore was a correct translation of ἀπ' ἄρτι at the time when our Version was made. Compare Matt. xxvi. 64, and the petition "that we may *hereafter* live a godly, righteous, and sober life" — *i.e.*, not at some future time, but "from this day forward." The reading, however, is very dubious, and B, L, as well as several versions, and Origen, etc., omit it. The Ἀμὴν is found twenty-five times in St. John, and always doubled. Cf. Isa. lxv. 16 (where God is called the "God of אָמֵן"); 2 Cor. i. 20; Rev. iii. 14. For the Messianic title Son of Man — a title describing the Messiah as the essential representative of every child in the great human family of God — see Dan. vii. 13, 14; Rev. i. 13, etc.

[2] "Son of Man," *Ben-adam*, may, in its general sense, be applied to any man (Job xxv. 6; Ps. cxliv. 3, etc.), but it is applied in a *special* sense to Ezekiel in the Old Testament, and to Christ in the New. One very observable fact is, that though used of Ezekiel nearly ninety times, he does not once apply the title to himself; and though used about eighty times of Christ, it is never used by any but Himself, except in passages which describe His heavenly exaltation (Acts vii. 56; Rev. i. 13–20; xiv. 14). It seems further clear that though Ezekiel is called Ben-Adam (perhaps, in the midst of his revelations, to remind him of his own nothingness), μέμνησο ἄνθρωπος ὢν), the title in the New Testament being clearly drawn from Daniel (vii. 13), is the Chaldee *Bar-enösh*, which represents humanity in its greatest frailty and humility, and is a significant declaration that the exaltation of Christ in His kingly and judicial office is due to His previous self-humiliation in His human nature (Phil. ii. 5–11). (Bishop Wordsworth s.v. in Smith's *Dict. of Bible* iii. 1359, who quotes Cypr. *De Idol. Vanit.*, p. 538, "hominem induit, quem perducat ad Patrem," and Aug. *Serm.* 121, "Filius Dei factus est filius hominis, ut vos, qui eratis filii hominis, efficeremini filii Dei.") The term *benî ish*, found in Ps. iv. 3, etc., means "filii *viri*," not "filii *hominis*." Bengel, on this verse (John i. 51), referring to 1 Cor. xv. 47, says, "Unus hic nempe homo est, quem Adamus, post lapsum, expectavit."

CHAPTER XI.

THE FIRST MIRACLE.

"Unde rubor vestris et non sua purpura lymphis?
Quae rosa mirantes tam nova mutat aquas?
Numen, convivae, praesens agnoscite numen:
Lympha pudica Deum vidit et erubuit." — CRASHAW.

"ON the third day," says St. John, "there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee." Writing with a full knowledge and vivid recollection of every fact that took place during those divinely memorable days, he gives his indications of time as though all were equally familiar with them. The third day has been understood in different manners: it is simplest to understand it as the third after the departure of Jesus for Galilee. If He were travelling expeditiously He might stop on the first night (supposing him to follow the ordinary route) at Shiloh or at Shechem; on the second at En-Gannim; on the third, crossing the plain of Jezreel, He could easily reach Nazareth,[1] and finding that His mother and brethren were not there, might, in an hour and a half longer, reach Cana in time for the ceremonies of an Oriental wedding.[2]

[1] The author has done this himself, and therefore knows that it is easily possible, although it requires quick travelling. There would, however, be nothing on this occasion to make Jesus linger, and possibly he was journeying with the express intention of being present at the marriage feast. The fact that a wedding will soon take place is usually known throughout an Eastern village, and Jesus might easily have heard about it from one of His disciples, or from some other Galilæan pilgrim.

[2] It will be seen from this paragraph that I consider Kefr Kenna, and not the so-called Kâna el-Jalîl, to be the real Cana. On this point I entirely agree with De Saulcy as against Dr. Robinson. If I am right in the explanation of "the third day," it will be an additional argument in favor of this view. I say "the so-called Kâna el-Jalîl," because certainly the more ordinary name of this ruined and deserted village is Khurbet Kâna, and Thomson (*The Land and the Book*) could find no trace worth mentioning of the other name, which rests solely on Robinson's authority; moreover, the name Kenna el-Jalîl is certainly sometimes given to Kefr Kenna, as Osborne testifies. The philological difficulty is by no means insuperable; tradition too, fairly tested, is in favor of Kefr Kenna; and its position (far nearer to Nazareth and Capernaum than Khurbet Kâna, and lying on the direct road) is in every respect more in accordance with the indications of the Gospel narrative than its more remote and desolate rival. Moreover, at Kefr Kenna there are distinct traces of antiquity, and

It is well known that those ceremonies began at twilight. It was the custom in Palestine, no less than in Greece,

> "To bear away
> The bride from home at blushing shut of day,"

or even later, far on into the night,[1] covered from head to foot in her loose and flowing veil, garlanded with flowers, and dressed in her fairest robes. She was heralded by torch-light, with songs and dances, and the music of the drum and flute, to the bridegroom's home. She was attended by the maidens of her village, and the bridegroom came to meet her with his youthful friends. Legend says that Nathanael was on this occasion the paranymph, whose duty it was to escort the bride; but the presence of Mary, who must have left Nazareth on purpose to be present at the wedding, seems to show that one of the bridal pair was some member of the Holy Family. Jesus too was invited, and His disciples, and the use of the singular (ἐκλήθη) implies that they were invited for His sake, not He for theirs. It is not likely, therefore, that Nathanael, who had only heard the name of Jesus two days before, had anything to do with the marriage. All positive conjecture is idle; but the fact that the Virgin evidently took a leading position in the house, and commands the servants in a tone of authority, renders it not improbable that this may have been the wedding of one of her nephews, the sons of Alphæus, or even of one of her daughters, "the sisters of Jesus,"[2] to whom tradition gives the names Esther and Thamar. That Joseph himself was dead is evident from the complete silence of the Evangelists, who, after Christ's first visit to Jerusalem as a boy, make no further mention of his name.[3]

Whether the marriage festival lasted for seven days, as

at the other place there are none. If in fact it be a mere hallucination to suppose that Khurbet Kâna is at all known under the designation of Kâna el-Jalîl, more than half of the reasons for identifying it with Cana of Galilee fall to the ground. Now on this point Mr. Thomson is far more likely to be right than Dr. Robinson, from his long residence in Palestine, and great knowledge of Arabic.

[1] When in Palestine I arrived at El Jîb about sunset, and found that the festivities of a wedding were just commencing. They lasted till late at night.

[2] Matt. xiii. 56. See, however, Luke iv. 22; John vi. 42.

[3] The notion that the bridegroom was Simon the Canaanite arises from a complete, but not unnatural, error about his name. An improbable tradition followed by St. Jerome and St. Bonaventura, and adopted by the Mahometans (D'Herbelot, s.v. "Johannes"), represents that the bridegroom was the Evangelist St. John.

was usual among those who could afford it,[1] or only for one or two, as was the case among the poorer classes, we cannot tell; but at some period of the entertainment the wine suddenly ran short.[2] None but those who know how sacred in the East is the duty of lavish hospitality, and how passionately the obligation to exercise it to the utmost is felt, can realize the gloom which this incident would have thrown over the occasion, or the misery and mortification which it would have caused to the wedded pair. They would have felt it to be, as in the East it would still be felt to be, a bitter and indelible disgrace.

Now the presence of Jesus and his five disciples may well have been the cause of this unexpected deficiency. The invitation, as we have seen, was originally intended for Jesus alone, nor could the youthful bridegroom in Cana of Galilee have been in the least aware that during the last four days Jesus had won the allegiance of five disciples. It is probable that no provision had been made for this increase of numbers, and that it was their unexpected presence which caused the deficiency in this simple household.[3] Moreover, it is hardly probable that, coming from a hasty journey of ninety miles, the little band could, even had their means permitted it, have conformed to the common Jewish custom of bringing with them wine and other provisions to contribute to the mirthfulness of the wedding feast.

Under these circumstances, therefore, there was a special reason why the mother of Jesus should say to Him, "They have no wine." The remark was evidently a pointed one, and its import could not be misunderstood. None knew, as Mary knew, who her Son was; yet for thirty long years of patient waiting for this manifestation, she had but seen Him grow as other children grow, and live, in sweetness indeed and humility and grace of sinless wisdom, like a tender plant before God, but in all other respects as other youths have lived, pre-eminent only in utter stainlessness. But now He was thirty years old; the voice of the great Prophet, with whose fame the nation rang, had proclaimed Him to be the promised Christ; He was being publicly attended by disciples who acknowledged Him as Rabbi and Lord. Here was a difficulty to be met; an act of true kindness to be performed; a disgrace to be averted from friends

[1] Judg. xiv. 12; Tob. xi. 19.

[2] John ii. 3, ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου.

[3] In some MSS. of the Vetus Itala are added the words, "Et factum est per multam turbam vocatorum vinum consummari."

whom He loved — and that too a disgrace to which His own presence and that of his disciples had unwittingly contributed. Was not His hour yet come? Who could tell what He might do, if He were only made aware of the trouble which threatened to interrupt the feast? Might not some band of hymning angels, like the radiant visions who had heralded His birth, receive His bidding to change that humble marriage-feast into a scene of heaven? Might it not be that even now He would lead them into His banquet-house, and His banner over them be love?

Her faith was strong, her motives pure, except perhaps what has been called "the slightest possible touch of the purest womanly, motherly anxiety (we know no other word) prompting in her the desire to see *her Son* honored in her presence."[1] And her Son's hour *had* nearly come: but it was necessary now, at once, forever, for that Son to show to her that henceforth he was not Jesus the Son of Mary, but the Christ the Son of God; that as regarded His great work and mission, as regarded His Eternal Being, the significance of the beautiful relationship had passed away; that His thoughts were not as her thoughts, neither His ways her ways.[2] It could not have been done in a manner more decisive, yet at the same time more entirely tender.

"*Woman, what have I to do with thee?*" The words at first sound harsh, and almost repellent in their roughness and brevity; but that is the fault partly of our version, partly of our associations. He does not call her "mother," because, in circumstances such as these, she was His mother no longer; but the address "Woman" (*Γύναι*) was so respectful that it might be, and was, addressed to the queenliest;[3] and so gentle that it might be, and was, addressed at the

[1] Stier i. 61, E. Tr. The germ of the remark is to be found in Chrysostom.

[2] Similarly in Luke ii. 49, the authority of Joseph is wholly subordinated to a truer and loftier one (see p. 78). The same truth is distinctly shadowed forth in Matt. xii. 48–50; Luke xi. 27, 28. St. Bernard, in illustration of the desire of our Lord to indicate that the spiritual life must not be disturbed by earthly relationships, tells a striking story of a hermit who, on being consulted by his brother, referred him to the advice of another brother who had died some time before. "But he is dead," said the other with surprise. "So am I also," replied the hermit. (S. Bernard, *Serm.* 2 *in Dom.* 1 *post Epiphan.*) It may have been their inability to appreciate this very fact that produced a sort of alienation between Christ and His earthly brethren as regards the entire plan of His Messianic manifestation, and made Him imply that even "*in his own house*" a prophet is without honor (Matt. xiii. 57).

[3] As by the Emperor Augustus to Cleopatra *Θάρσει, ὦ γύναι, καὶ θυμὸν ἔχε ἀγαθόν* (Dio. Cass. *Hist.* li. 12); by the chorus to Queen Clytemnestra (Æsch. *Ag.* 1603); and not unfrequently to princesses in Greek tragedy.

tenderest moments to the most fondly loved.[1] And "what have I to do with thee?" is a literal version of a common Aramaic phrase (*mah lî velâk*), which, while it sets aside a suggestion and waives all further discussion of it, is yet perfectly consistent with the most delicate courtesy, and the most feeling consideration.[2]

Nor can we doubt that even the slight check involved in these quiet words was still more softened by the look and accent with which they were spoken, and which are often sufficient to prevent far harsher utterances from inflicting any pain. For with undiminished faith, and with no trace of pained feeling, Mary said to the servants — over whom it is clear she was exercising some authority — "Whatever He says to you, do it at once."[3]

The first necessity after a journey in the East is to wash the feet, and before a meal to wash the hands; and to supply these wants there were standing (as still is usual), near the entrance of the house, six large stone water-jars, with their orifices filled with bunches of fresh green leaves to keep the water cool. Each of these jars contained two or three *baths*[4] of water, and Jesus bade the servants at once fill them to the brim.[5] They did so, and He then ordered them to draw out the contents in smaller vessels,[6] and carry it to the guest who, according to the festive custom of the time, had been elected "governor of the feast."[7] Knowing nothing of what

[1] As, for instance, by Jesus to Mary Magdalene, in the garden, "*Woman*, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou?" (John xx. 15); by the angels (id. 13); and by Jesus to His mother on the cross, "Woman, behold thy son" (John xix. 26). Our Lord probably spoke, however, in Aramaic, and here the word would be אנתה, not אישה, *i.e.*, more like *domina* than *femina*.

[2] See for other instances of the phrase, 2 Sam. xvi. 10; xix. 22; 1 Kings xvii. 18; Judg. xi. 12; 2 Kings iii. 13; Josh. xxii. 24.

[3] ποιήσατε (John ii. 5). For the expression, "Mine hour is not yet come," see the instance in which, with a very similar desire to check the unwarranted suggestions of His earthly relatives, He uses it to His brethren who wished to hurry His visit to Jerusalem (John vii. 6, where, however, the word is καιρὸς, not ὥρα). Mr. Sanday compares the passage with Matt. xv. 21–28. "There too a petition is first refused, and then granted; and there too the petitioner seems to divine that it will be" (*Authorship of the Fourth Gosp.*, p. 50).

[4] μετρηταί. This is used in the LXX. version of 2 Chron. iv. 5 as a rendering of the Hebrew בַּת, and was equal to about 7½ gallons. It is, however, hard to suppose that each of these stone jars held from fifteen to twenty-two gallons, so that perhaps μετρητὴς (as Lange suggests) may be the Roman *amphora* = five gallons. A "firkin" (E.V.) is eight gallons.

[5] John ii. 7, γεμίσατε.

[6] ἀντλήσατε. Cf. John iv. 7. Professor Westcott thinks that the exact words exclude the all but universal notion, *that all the water in the six jars* was turned into wine (*Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*, p 15).

[7] The custom may have been originally borrowed from the Greeks

had taken place, he mirthfully observed that in offering the good wine last, the bridegroom had violated the common practice of banquets. This was Christ's first miracle, and *thus*, with a definite and symbolic purpose,[1] did He manifest His glory, and His disciples believed on Him.

It was His first miracle, yet how unlike all that we should have expected; how simply unobtrusive, how divinely calm! The method, indeed, of the miracle — which is far more wonderful in character than the ordinary miracles of healing — transcends our powers of conception; yet it was not done with any pomp of circumstance, or blaze of adventitious glorification. Men in these days have presumptuously talked as though it were God's duty — the duty of Him to whom the sea and the mountains are a very little thing, and before whose eyes the starry heaven is but as one white gleam in the "intense inane" — to perform His miracles before a circle of competent *savans!* Conceivably it might be so had it been intended that miracles should be the sole, or even the main, credentials of Christ's authority; but to the belief of Christendom the Son of God would still be the Son of God even if, like John, He had done no miracle. The miracles of Christ were miracles addressed, not to a cold and sceptic curiosity, but to a loving and humble faith. They needed not the acuteness of the impostor, or the self-assertion of the thaumaturge. They were indeed the signs — almost, we had said, the accidental signs — of His divine mission; but their primary object was the alleviation of human suffering, or the illustration of sacred truths, or as in this instance, the increase of innocent joy. An obscure village, an ordinary wedding, a humble home, a few faithful peasant guests — such a scene, and no splendid amphitheatre or stately audience, beheld one of Christ's greatest miracles of power. And in these respects the circumstances of the First Miracle are exactly analogous to the supernatural events recorded of Christ's birth. In the total unlikeness of this to all that we should have imagined — in its absolute contrast with anything which legend would have invented — in all, in short, which most offends the unbeliever, we see but fresh confirmation that we are reading the words of soberness and truth.

(συμποσιάρχης, *arbiter bibendi*, *magister convivii*, etc.), but it had long been familiar to the Jews, and the ἀρχιτρίκλινος here acts exactly as he is advised to do by the son of Sirach: "When thou hast done all thy office, take thy place, that thou mayest be merry with them, and receive a crown for thy well-ordering of the feast" (Ecclus. xxxii. 1, 2).

[1] John ii. 11, ταύτην ἐποίησε ἀρχὴν (this *as* a beginning, A, B, L, etc.), not τὴν ἀρχήν.

A miracle is a miracle, and we see no possible advantage in trying to understand the *means* by which it was wrought. In accepting the evidence for it — and it is for each man to be fully persuaded in his own mind, and to accept or to reject at his pleasure, perhaps even it may prove to be at his peril — we are avowedly accepting the evidence for something which transcends, though it by no means necessarily supersedes, the ordinary laws by which Nature works. What is gained — in what single respect does the miracle become, so to speak, easier or more comprehensible — by supposing, with Olshausen, that we have here only an accelerated process of nature; or with Neander, that the powers of water were magnetized into those of wine; or with Lange (apparently), that the guests were in a state of supernatural exaltation?[1] Let those who find it intellectually possible, or spiritually advantageous, freely avail themselves of such hypotheses if they see their way to do so: to us they seem, not "irreverent," not "rationalistic," not "dangerous," but simply embarrassing and needless. To denounce them as unfaithful concessions to the spirit of scepticism may suit the exigencies of a violent and Pharisaic theology, but is unworthy of that calm charity which should be the fairest fruit of Christian faith. In matters of faith it ought to be to every one of us "a very small thing to be judged of you or of man's judgment;" we ought to believe, or disbelieve, or modify belief, with sole reference to that which, in our hearts and consciences, we feel to be the Will of God; and it is by His judgment, and by His alone, that we should care to stand or to fall. We as little claim a right to scathe the rejecter of miracles by abuse and anathema, as we admit *his* right to sneer at us for imbecility or hypocrisy. Jesus has taught to all men, whether they accept or reject Him, the lessons of charity and sweetness; and what the believer and the unbeliever alike can do, is calmly, temperately, justly, and with perfect

[1] Olshausen, *Comment. on the Gospels*, iii. 368, following Augustine, "Ipse fecit vinum in nuptiis qui omni anno hoc facit in vitibus." Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ*, E. Tr., p. 176. It is to be regretted that this "acceleration" hypothesis has been received with favor by some eminent English divines; *Nature alone*, as a friend remarks, will never, whatever time you give her, make thirty imperial gallons of wine without at least ten pounds avoirdupois of carbon. Ewald beautifully, but with a perhaps intentional vagueness, says, "Wir würden uns diesen wein, der seit jener zeit auch uns noch immer fliessen kann, selbst übel verwässern, wenn wir hier in groben sinne fragen wollten wiedenn aus blossem wasser im augenblicke wein werden könne: soll denn das wasser im besten sinne des wortes nicht überall auch jezt noch zu weine wurden wo Sein geist in voller kraft thatig ist?" (*Gesch. Christ.*, p. 329.)

and solemn sincerity — knowing how deep are the feelings involved, and how vast the issues at stake between us — to state the reason for the belief that is in him. And this being so, I would say that if we once understand that the word Nature has little or no meaning unless it be made to include the idea of its Author; if we once realize the fact, which all science teaches us, that the very simplest and most elementary operation of the laws of Nature is infinitely beyond the comprehension of our most exalted intelligence; if we once believe that the Divine Providence of God is no far-off abstraction, but a living and loving care over the lives of man; lastly, if we once believe that Christ was the only-begotten Son of God, the Word of God who came to reveal and declare His Father to mankind, then there is nothing in any Gospel miracle to shock our faith: we shall regard the miracles of Christ as resulting from the fact of His Being and His mission, no less naturally and inevitably than the rays of light stream outwards from the sun. They were, to use the favorite expression of St. John, not merely "portents" (τέρατα), or powers (δυνάμεις), or signs (σημεῖα), but they were works (ἔργα), the ordinary and inevitable works (whenever He chose to exercise them) of One whose very Existence was the highest miracle of all.[1] For our faith is that He was sinless; and to borrow the words of a German poet, "one might have thought that the miracle of miracles was to have created the world such as it is; yet it is a far greater miracle to have lived a perfectly pure life therein." The greatest of modern philosophers said that there were two things which overwhelmed his soul with awe and astonishment, "the starry heaven above, and the moral law within;" but to these has been added a third reality no less majestic — the fulfilment of the moral law *without* us in the Person of Jesus Christ.[2] That fulfilment makes us believe that He was indeed Divine; and if He were Divine, we have no further astonishment left when we are taught that He did on earth that which can be done by the Power of God alone.

But there are two characteristics of this first miracle which we ought to notice.

One is its divine unselfishness. His ministry is to be a ministry of joy and peace; His sanction is to be given not to a crushing asceticism, but to a genial innocence; His

[1] See Abp. Trench on *Miracles*, p. 8.
[2] See Ullmann, *Sinlessness of Jesus*, E. Tr., pp. 181-193.

approval, not to a compulsory celibacy, but to a sacred union. He who, to appease His own sore hunger, would not turn the stones of the wilderness into bread, gladly exercises, for the sake of others, His transforming power; and but six or seven days afterwards, relieves the perplexity and sorrow of a humble wedding feast by turning water into wine. The first miracle of Moses was, in stern retribution, to turn the river of a guilty nation into blood; the first of Jesus to fill the water-jars of an innocent family with wine.

And the other is its symbolic character. Like nearly all the miracles of Christ, it combines the characteristics of a work of mercy, an emblem, and a prophecy. The world gives its best first, and afterwards all the dregs and bitterness; but Christ came to turn the lower into the richer and sweeter, the Mosaic law into the perfect law of liberty, the baptism of John into the baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the self-denials of a painful isolation into the self-denials of a happy home, sorrow and sighing into hope and blessing, and water into wine. And thus the "holy estate" which Christ adorned and beautified with His presence and first miracle in Cana of Galilee, foreshadows the mystical union between Christ and His Church; and the common element which He thus miraculously changed becomes a type of our life on earth transfigured and ennobled by the anticipated joys of heaven — a type of that wine which He shall drink new with us in the kingdom of God, at the marriage supper of the Lamb.[1]

[1] A large school of English Apologists have appealed to the miracles of Christ as proving His mission, and to the Gospels as proving the miracles. This is not the view of the writer, who, in common he believes with many of the more recent authorities who have dealt with the subject, regards "Christianity and Christendom" as the strongest external proofs of the historical reality of that which the Gospels relate. The Gospels supply us with a *vera caussa* for that which otherwise would be to us an inexplicable enigma. This was the argument which I endeavored to state as forcibly as I could in the Hulsean Lectures of 1870 — "The Witness of History to Christ." But I say "the strongest *external* proof," because those who are so ready to assume that any one who believes, for instance, in the Incarnation must necessarily be either morally a hypocrite, or intellectually an imbecile, ought not to forget how strong is that *preparation for belief* which every Christian derives from the experiences of his own life, and from that which he believes to be the Voice of God speaking to his heart, and confirming all which he has learnt of God through Christ, and Christ alone. The force of *this* evidence is indeed valueless as an argument against others; on the other hand, they should bear in mind that their denial of its force in their own case does not invalidate its force in the minds of those for whom it exists.

CHAPTER XII.

THE SCENE OF THE MINISTRY.

"Give true hearts but earth and sky,
And some flowers to bloom and die;
Homely scenes and simple views
Lowly thoughts may best infuse."
KEBLE, "*First Sunday after Epiphany.*"

CHRIST'S first miracle of Cana was a sign that He came, not to call His disciples *out* of the world and its ordinary duties, but to make men happier, nobler, better *in* the world. He willed that they should be husbands, and fathers, and citizens, not eremites or monks. He would show that He approved the brightness of pure society, and the mirth of innocent gatherings, no less than the ecstasies of the ascetic in the wilderness, or the visions of the mystic in his solitary cell.

And, as pointing the same moral, there was something significant in the place which He chose as the scene of His earliest ministry. St. John had preached in the lonely wastes by the Dead Sea waters; his voice had been echoed back by the flinty precipices that frown over the sultry Ghôr. The city nearest to the scene of his teaching had been built in defiance of a curse, and the road to it led through "the bloody way." All around him breathed the dreadful associations of a guilty and desolated past; the very waves were bituminous; the very fruits crumbled into foul ashes under the touch; the very dust beneath his feet lay, hot and white, over the relics of an abominable race. There, beside those leaden waters, under that copper heaven, amid those burning wildernesses and scarred ravines, had he preached the baptism of repentance. But Christ, amid the joyous band of His mother, and His brethren, and His disciples, chose as the earliest centre of His ministry a bright and busy city, whose marble buildings were mirrored in a limpid sea.

This little city was Capernaum. It rose under the gentle

declivities of hills that encircled an earthly Paradise.[1] There were no such trees, and no such gardens, anywhere in Palestine as in the land of Gennesareth. The very name means "garden of abundance,"[2] and the numberless flowers blossom over a little plain which is "in sight like unto an emerald." It was doubtless a part of Christ's divine plan that His ministry should begin amid scenes so beautiful, and that the good tidings, which revealed to mankind their loftiest hopes and purest pleasures, should be first proclaimed in a region of unusual loveliness. The features of the scene are neither gorgeous nor colossal; there is nothing here of the mountain gloom or the mountain glory; nothing of that "dread magnificence" which overawes us as we gaze on tropical volcanoes or northern hills.

Had our life on earth been full of wild and terrible catastrophes, then it might have been fitly symbolized by scenes which told only of deluge and conflagration; but these green pastures and still waters, these bright birds and flowering oleanders, the dimpling surface of that inland sea, so doubly delicious and refreshful in a sultry land, all correspond with the characteristics of a life composed of innocent and simple elements, and brightened with the ordinary pleasures which, like the rain and the sunshine, are granted to all alike.

What the traveller will see as he emerges from the Valley of Doves, and catches his first eager glimpse of Gennesareth, will be a small inland sea, like a harp in shape,[3] thirteen miles long and six broad. On the farther or eastern side runs a green strip about a quarter of a mile in breadth,[4] beyond which rises, to the height of some 900 feet above the level of the lake, an escarpment of desolate hills, scored with gray ravines, without tree, or village, or vestige of cultivation — the frequent scene of our Lord's retirement when, after His weary labors, He sought the deep refreshment of solitude with God. The lake — with its glittering crystal, and fringe of flowering oleanders, through whose green leaves shine the bright blue wings of the roller-bird, and the kingfishers may be seen in multitudes dashing down at the fish that

[1] John ii. 12, *κατέβη* — a touch of accuracy, since the road is one long descent.

[2] "Quare vocatur Gennezar? *ob hortos principum* (*ganne sarim*)" (Lightfoot, *Cent. Chorogr.* lxxi).

[3] This is said to be the origin of the ancient name "Chinnereth," a beautiful onomatopœia for a harp. The Wady Hammâm, or "Valley of Doves," is a beautiful gorge in the hills by which the traveller may descend from Hattîn to Mejdel.

[4] Except at one spot, the probable scene of the cure of the Gadarene demoniacs, where the hills run close up to the water.

glance beneath them — lies at the bottom of a great dent or basin in the earth's surface, more than 500 feet below the level of the Mediterranean.[1] Hence the burning and enervating heat of the valley; but hence, too, the variety of its foliage, the fertility of its soil, the luxuriance of its flora, the abundant harvests that ripen a month earlier than they do elsewhere, and the number of rivulets that tumble down the hillsides into the lake. The shores are now deserted. With the exception of the small and decaying town of Tiberias — crumbling into the last stage of decrepitude — and the "frightful village" of Mejdel (the ancient Magdala), where the degradation of the inhabitants is best shown by the fact that the children play stark naked in the street — there is not a single inhabited spot on its once crowded shores.[2] One miserable, crazy boat — and that not always procurable — has replaced its gay and numerous fleet. As the fish are still abundant, no fact could show more clearly the dejected inanity and apathetic enervation of the present dwellers upon its shores. But the natural features still remain. The lake still lies unchanged in the bosom of the hills, reflecting every varying gleam of the atmosphere like an opal set in emeralds; the waters are still as beautiful in their clearness as when the boat of Peter lay rocking on their ripples, and Jesus gazed into their crystal depths; the cup-like basin still seems to overflow with its flood of sunlight; the air is still balmy with natural perfumes; the turtle-dove still murmurs in the valleys, and the pelican fishes in the waves; and there are palms and green fields, and streams, and gray heaps of ruin. And what it has lost in population and activity, it has gained in solemnity and interest. If every vestige of human habitation should disappear from beside it, and the jackal and the hyena should howl about the shattered fragments of the synagogues where once Christ taught, yet the fact that He chose it as the scene of His opening ministry[3] will give a sense of sacredness and pathos to its lonely waters till time shall be no more.

[1] Hence the plain of Gennesareth is called by the Arabs El-Ghuweir, or "the little hollow," to distinguish it from El-Ghôr, "the great hollow," *i.e.*, the Jordan valley.

[2] A few Bedawîn may sometimes be found at Ain et-Tâbijah (Bethsaida). Renan truly observes that a furnace such as El-Ghuweir *now* is, could hardly have been the scene of such prodigious activity, had not the climate been modified by the numberless trees, which under the withering influence of Islam have all been destroyed.

[3] Acts x. 37: St. Peter says, "That word which was preached throughout all Judæa, and *began from Galilee*." Luke xxiii. 5: "Beginning from Galilee."

Yet widely different must have been its general aspect in the time of Christ, and far more strikingly beautiful, because far more richly cultivated. Josephus in a passage of glowing admiration, after describing the sweetness of its waters, and the delicate temperature of its air, its palms, and vines, and oranges, and figs, and almonds, and pomegranates, and warm springs, says that the seasons seemed to compete for the honor of its possession, and Nature to have created it as a kind of emulative challenge, wherein she had gathered all the elements of her strength.[1] The Talmudists see in the fact that this plain — "the ambition of Nature" — belonged to the tribe of Naphtali, a fulfilment of the Mosaic blessing, that that tribe should be "satisfied with favor, and full with the blessing of the Lord;"[2] and they had the proverb, true in a deeper sense than they suppose, that "God had created seven seas in the land of Canaan, but one only — the Sea of Galilee — had He chosen for Himself."

Not, however, for its beauty only, but because of its centrality, and its populous activity, it was admirably adapted for that ministry which fulfilled the old prophecy of Isaiah, that "the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles," should "see a great light;" and that to them "who sat in the region and shadow of death" should "light spring up." For Christ was to be, even in His own lifetime, "a light to lighten the Gentiles," as well as "the glory of His people Israel." And people of many nationalities dwelt in and encompassed this neighborhood, because it was "the way of the sea." "The cities," says Josephus, "lie here very thick; and the very numerous villages are so full of people, because of the fertility of the land . . . . that the very smallest of them contain above 15,000 inhabitants."[3] He adds that the people were active, industrious, and inured to war from infancy, cultivating every acre of their rich and beautiful soil. No less than four roads communicated with the shores of the lake. One led down the Jordan valley on the western side; another, crossing a bridge at the south of the lake, passed through Peræa to the fords of Jordan near Jericho; a third led, through Sepphoris, the gay and rising capital of Galilee, to the

[1] The Rabbis refer to its extraordinary fruitfulness (*Bab. Pesachim*, f. 8, 2; *Berachoth*, f. 44, 1; Lightfoot, *ubi supr.*; Caspari, p. 69, etc.) φιλοτιμίαν ἄν τις εἴποι τῆς φύσεως (Jos. *B. Jud.* iii. 10, §§ 7, 8).

[2] Deut. xxxiii. 23.

[3] Jos. *B. J.* iii. 3, § 2. See note 1, p. 147.

TIBERIUS.

famous port of Accho on the Mediterranean Sea; a fourth ran over the mountains of Zebulon to Nazareth, and so through the plain of Esdraelon to Samaria and Jerusalem. Through this district passed the great caravans on their way from Egypt to Damascus; and the heathens who congregated at Bethsaida Julius and Cæsarea Philippi must have been constantly seen in the streets of Capernaum. In the time of Christ it was, for population and activity, "the manufacturing district" of Palestine, and the waters of its lake were ploughed by 4,000 vessels of every description, from the war-vessel of the Romans to the rough fisher-boats of Bethsaida, and the gilded pinnaces from Herod's palace. Ituræa, Samaria, Syria, Phœnicia were immediately accessible by crossing the lake, the river, or the hills. The town of Tiberias, which Herod Antipas had built to be the capital of Galilee, and named in honor of the reigning emperor, had risen with marvellous rapidity; by the time that St. John wrote his Gospel it had already given its name to the Sea of Galilee; and even if Christ never entered its heathenish amphitheatre or grave-polluted streets,[1] He must have often seen in the distance its turreted walls, its strong castle, and the Golden House of Antipas, flinging far into the lake the reflection of its marble lions and sculptured architraves.[2] Europe, Asia, and Africa had contributed to its population, and men of all nations met in its market-place. All along the western shores of Gennesareth Jews and Gentiles were strangely mingled, and the wild Arabs of the desert might there be seen side by side with enterprising Phœnicians, effeminate Syrians, contemptuous Romans, and supple, wily, corrupted Greeks.

The days of delightful seclusion in the happy valley of Nazareth were past; a life of incessant toil, of deep anxiety, of trouble, and wandering, and opposition, of preaching, healing, and doing good, was now to begin. At this earliest dawn of His public entrance upon His ministry, our Lord's first stay in Capernaum was not for many days; yet these days would be a type of all the remaining life. He would

[1] Being built on the site of an old cemetery, no true Jew could enter it without ceremonial pollution (see Lightfoot, *Cent. Chorogr.*, lxxxi.). Josephus (*Antt.* xviii. 2, § 3) expressly says that, from the number of tombs which had to be removed in laying the foundations, every Jew who inhabited it became unclean (Numb. xix. 11); and hence Herod Antipas, who built it (*B. J.* ii. 9, § 1), had to *compel* people to reside in it, or to bribe them by very substantial privileges (*Antt.* xviii. 2, § 3). It is probable that Christ never set foot within its precincts; yet some of the inhabitants were, of course, among His hearers (John vi. 23).

[2] Jos. *Vit.* 9, 12, 13; *B. Jud.* ii. 21, § 6.

preach in a Jewish synagogue built by a Roman centurion, and His works of love would become known to men of many nationalities.[1] It would be clear to all that the new Prophet who had risen was wholly unlike His great forerunner. The hairy mantle, the ascetic seclusion, the unshorn locks, would have been impossible and out of place among the inhabitants of those crowded and busy shores. Christ came not to revolutionize, but to ennoble and to sanctify. He came to reveal that the Eternal was not the *Future*, but only the *Unseen;* that Eternity was no ocean whither men were being swept by the river of Time, but was around them now, and that their lives were only real in so far as they felt its reality and its presence. He came to teach that God was no dim abstraction, infinitely separated from them in the far-off blue, but that He was the Father in whom they lived, and moved, and had their being; and that the service which he loved was not ritual and sacrifice, not pompous scrupulosity and censorious orthodoxy, but mercy and justice, humility and love. He came not to hush the natural music of men's lives, nor to fill it with storm and agitation, but to retune every silver chord in that "harp of a thousand strings," and to make it echo with the harmonies of heaven.

And such being the significance of Christ's life in this lovely region, it is strange that the exact site of Capernaum — of Capernaum, "His own City" (Matt. ix. 1), which witnessed so many of His mightiest miracles, which heard so many of His greatest revelations — should remain to this day a matter of uncertainty. That it was indeed *either* at Khan Minyeh *or* at Tell Hûm is reasonably certain; but at which? Both towns are in the immediate vicinity of Bethsaida and of Chorazin; both are beside the waves of Galilee; both lie on the "way of the sea;" the claims of both are supported by powerful arguments; the decision in favor of either involves difficulties as yet unsolved. After visiting the scenes, and carefully studying on the spot the arguments of travellers in many volumes, the preponderance of evidence seems to me in favor of Tell Hûm. There, on bold rising ground, encumbered with fragments of white marble, rise the ruined walls of what was perhaps a synagogue, built in the florid and composite style which marks the Herodian age; and amid the rank grass and gigantic thistles lie scattered the remnants of pillars and architraves which prove

[1] That some great works were performed during this brief visit seems clear from Luke iv. 23; but that they could scarcely be regarded as miracles seems equally clear from John iv. 54.

that on this spot once stood a beautiful and prosperous town.[1] At Khan Minyeh there is nothing but a common ruined caravanserai and gray mounded heaps, which may or may not be the ruins of ruins. But whichever of the two was the site on which stood the home of Peter — which was also the home of Christ (Matt. viii. 14) — either is desolate; even the wandering Bedawy seems to shun those ancient ruins, where the fox and the jackal prowl at night. The sad and solemn woe that was uttered upon the then bright and flourishing city has been fulfilled: "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it had remained unto this day."[2]

[1] Major Wilson, R.E., of the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, found that the plan of the large white building at Tell Hûm consisted of "four rows of seven columns each . . . surrounded by a blank wall, ornamented outside with pilasters, and apparently a heavy cornice of late date; . . . but what puzzles me is that the entrance was on the south side, which does not seem to be usual in synagogues. The synagogue was surrounded by another building of later date, also well built and ornamented" (see Porter's *Handbook*, ii. 403).

[2] Luke x. 15; Matt. xi. 23. — The arguments about the site of Capernaum would fill several volumes. The reader may find most of them in Dr. Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, iii. 288–294; Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, ii. 139–149; Ritter, *Jordan*, 335–343; Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, 352 seqq., etc. Some new arguments are adduced in Mr. McGregor's *Rob Roy on the Jordan*. The recent researches of the Palestine Exploration Fund, under Major Wilson, seem to me to strengthen the case in favor of Tell Hûm very considerably; and Tell Hûm, "the ruined mound of Hum," is a very natural corruption of Kefr *Nahûm*, "the village of *Nahûm*." — As this chapter is on the scene of the ministry, it may be well to observe that the true version of the famous prophecy in Isa. ix. 1 is, "As of old He lightly esteemed the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali; so, in the latter time, *He hath made her glorious* by the way of the sea," etc. (See Perowne, *On the Psalms*, I. xix.)

CHAPTER XIII.

JESUS AT THE PASSOVER.

"The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple." — MAL. iii. 1.

THE stay of Jesus at Capernaum on this occasion was very short,[1] and it is not improbable that He simply awaited there the starting of the great caravan of pilgrims who, at this time, were about to wend their way to the great feast at Jerusalem.

The Synoptists are silent respecting any visit of Christ to the Passover between His twelfth year till His death;[2] and it is St. John alone who, true to the purpose and characteristics of his Gospel, mentions this earliest Passover of Christ's ministry, or gives us any particulars that took place during its progress.[3]

The main event which distinguished it was the purification of the Temple — an act so ineffectual to conquer the besetting vice of the Jews, that He was obliged to repeat it, with expressions still more stern, at the close of His ministry, and only four days before his death.[4]

[1] John ii. 12: "Not many days."

[2] But just as St. John distinctly implies the Galilæan ministry (vii. 3, 4), so the Synoptists distinctly imply that there must have been a Judæan ministry; *e.g.*, Judas is a Jew, and Joseph of Arimathæa; and our Lord was well known to people at and near Jerusalem (see Matt. iv. 25; xxiii. 37; Mark iii. 7, 8, 22; xi. 2, 3; xiv. 14; xv. 43–46; and compare Matt. xiii. 57). In Luke iv. 44 there is good MS. authority (א, B, C, L, etc.) for the reading, "He preached in the synagogues of Judæa." "The vague and shifting outlines of the Synoptists," says Mr. Sanday, "allow ample room for all the insertions that are made in them with so much precision by St. John" (*Fourth Gospel*, p. 166). See too the important testimony of St. Peter (Acts x. 37, 39).

[3] Other Passovers mentioned are John vi. 4; xi. 55. The feast of v. 1 would make four Passovers, if it were certain that a Passover were intended, and in any case we shall in the course of the narrative find much to confirm the opinion of Eusebius and Theodoret, that the ministry lasted three years and a few months. The τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων of St. John may perhaps be regarded as an indication that he wrote when the Passover had ceased to be possible.

[4] Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15–17; Luke xix. 45. It seems impossible to believe that the two narratives refer to the same event. The consequences of that act, and the answer which He then gives to the priests who asked for some proof of His commission to exercise this authority,

We have already seen what vast crowds flocked to the Holy City at the great annual feast. Then, as now, that immense multitude, composed of pilgrims from every land, and proselytes of every nation, brought with them many needs. The traveller who now visits Jerusalem at Easter time will make his way to the gates of the Church of the Sepulchre through a crowd of vendors of relics, souvenirs, and all kinds of objects, who, squatting on the ground, fill all the vacant space before the church, and overflow into the adjoining street. Far more numerous and far more noisome must have been the buyers and sellers who choked the avenues leading to the Temple, in the Passover to which Jesus now went among the other pilgrims;[1] for what they had to sell were not only trinkets and knick-knacks, such as now are sold to Easter pilgrims, but oxen, and sheep, and doves. On both sides of the eastern gate — the gate Shusan — as far as Solomon's porch, there had long been established the shops of merchants and the banks of money-changers. The latter were almost a necessity; for, twenty days before the Passover, the priests began to collect the old sacred tribute of half a shekel paid yearly by every Israelite, whether rich or poor, as atonement money for his soul, and applied to the expenses of the Tabernacle service.[2] Now it would not be lawful to pay this in coinage brought from all kinds of governments, sometimes represented by wretched counters of brass and copper, and always defiled with heathen symbols and heathen inscriptions. It was lawful to send this money to the priests from a distance, but every Jew who presented himself in the Temple preferred to pay it in person. He was therefore obliged to procure the little silver coin in return for his own currency, and the money-changers charged him five per cent as the usual *kolbon* or agio.[3]

Had this trafficking been confined to the streets immediately adjacent to the holy building, it would have been excusable, though not altogether seemly. Such scenes are described by heathen writers as occurring round the Temple

are quite different. To give all the arguments which in each case have led me to a particular conclusion on disputed points would require five times the space at my disposal, and would wholly alter the character of the book. I can only ask the reader to believe that I have always tried to weigh with impartiality the evidence on both sides.

[1] The date of this Passover was perhaps April, A.D. 28.

[2] Exod. xxx. 11-16.

[3] κόλλυβος. For full information on this subject, with the Rabbinic authorities, see Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, in Matt. xxi. 12.

of Venus at Mount Eryx, and of the Syrian goddess at Hierapolis — nay even, to come nearer home, such scenes once occurred in our own St. Paul's.[1] But the mischief had not stopped here. The vicinity of the Court of the Gentiles, with its broad spaces and long arcades, had been too tempting to Jewish greed. We learn from the Talmud that a certain Babha Ben Buta had been the first to introduce "3,000 sheep of the flocks of Kedar into the mountain of the House" — *i.e.*, into the Court of the Gentiles, and therefore within the consecrated precincts.[2] The profane example was eagerly followed. The *chanujôth* of the shopkeepers, the exchange booths of the usurers, gradually crept into the sacred enclosure. There, in the actual Court of the Gentiles, steaming with heat in the burning April day, and filling the Temple with stench and filth, were penned whole flocks of sheep and oxen,[3] while the drovers and pilgrims stood bartering and bargaining around them. There were the men with their great wicker cages filled with doves, and under the shadow of the arcades, formed by quadruple rows of Corinthian columns,[4] sat the money-changers, with their tables covered with piles of various small coins, while, as they reckoned and wrangled in the most dishonest of trades, their greedy eyes twinkled with the lust of gain. And this was the entrance-court to the Temple of the Most High! The court which was a witness that that house should be a House of Prayer for all nations had been degraded into a place which, for foulness, was more like shambles, and for bustling commerce more like a densely crowded bazaar; while the lowing of oxen, the bleating of sheep, the Babel of many languages, the huckstering and wrangling, and the clinking of money and of balances (perhaps not always just), might be heard in the adjoining courts, disturbing the chant of the Levites and the prayers of priests!

Filled with a righteous scorn at all this mean irreverence, burning with irresistible and noble indignation, Jesus, on entering the Temple, made a scourge of the rushes that lay on the floor; and in order to cleanse the sacred court of its

[1] Ælian, *Hist. Animal.* x. 50; Lucian, *De Deâ Syr.*, 41 (Sepp); Dixon's *Holy Land*, ii. 61.

[2] *Jer. Jôm. Tobh.*, f. 61, 3, quoted by Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, ubi supr.

[3] Their number may be conjectured from the fact that Herod alone sacrificed 300 oxen at the consecration of the new Temple (Jos. *Antt.* xv. 11, § 6). Josephus adds that Herod's example was followed by each according to his ability, so that it was impossible to set down correctly the vast number of the sacrifices.

[4] Jos. *Antt.* xv. 11, § 5.

worst pollutions, first drove out, indiscriminately, the sheep and oxen and the low crowd who tended them.[1] Then going to the tables of the money-changers, He overthrew them where they stood, upsetting the carefully arranged heaps of heterogeneous coinage, and leaving the owners to grope and hunt for their scattered money on the polluted floor. Even to those who sold doves He issued the mandate to depart, less sternly indeed, because the dove was the offering of the poor, and there was less desecration and foulness in the presence there of those lovely emblems of innocence and purity; nor could He overturn the tables of the dove-sellers lest the birds should be hurt in their cages; but still, even to those who sold doves, He authoritatively exclaimed, "Take these things hence," justifying his action to the whole terrified, injured, muttering, ignoble crowd in no other words than the high rebuke, "*Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise.*"[2] And His disciples, seeing this transport of inspiring and glorious anger, recalled to mind what David had once written "to the chief musician upon Shoshannim," for the service of that very Temple, "The zeal of thine house shall even devour me."[3]

Why did not this multitude of ignorant pilgrims resist? Why did these greedy chafferers content themselves with dark scowls and muttered maledictions, while they suffered

[1] John ii. 15, φραγέλλιον (the Roman *flagellum*), *id.* ἐξέβαλεν. That the scourge was for the men as well as the cattle is clear from the πάντας (ver. 15). On this occasion, however, our Lord used the expression "a house of merchandise," not, as afterwards, the sterner censure, "a den of robbers." (Cf. Jer. vii. 10, 11.) Luther's comment on this action is somewhat too free. "Ist das nicht aufrührisch?" he asks. "Diese That Christi ist nicht zum Exempel zu ziehen; er hat sie nicht als Diener des Neuen, sondern des Alten Testament und Mosis Schüler gethan" (Hase, p. 76). I quote this unbecoming and mistaken remark only to show how even the best and greatest fail to rise to the height of that universal morality of which the life of Jesus is the sole human example.

[2] Cf. Luke ii. 49. We find in the Talmud that doves were usually sold in the *chanujôth*, or "shops," belonging to the family of Annas on the Mount of Olives, who had so multiplied the occasions for offering them, that a single dove cost a gold piece, until this nefarious artificial value was reduced by the teachings of R. Simeon, the son of Gamaliel. Perhaps the profitableness of the trade had caused its extension to the Temple courts (Derenbourg, *Hist. de Palest. d'après les Thalmuds*, 467). He quotes *Keritoth*, i. 7. The expression *chanujôth beni Hanan* is found in *Jer. Pea.* i. 6 (*id. ib.*).

[3] Ps. lxix. 9. There is no doubt that καταφάγεται (ℵ, A, B, E, F, G, etc.) is the right reading; but it may by a Hebraism really imply the κατέφαγε of the LXX. The preterite, as a representative of the *present*, is employed also to denote the *future* (Gesen., *Hebr. Gram.*, § 124. 4; Turpie, *The Old Testament in the New*, p. 29). Bishop Wordsworth points out that St. John's phrase in quotation is γεγραμμένον ἐστι (vi. 31, 45; x. 34, etc.) that of the other Evangelists γέγραπται. We may notice that St. John's style is more analytical and more modern than that of the others.

their oxen and sheep to be chased into the streets and themselves ejected, and their money flung rolling on the floor, by one who was then young and unknown, and in the garb of despised Galilee? Why, in the same way we might ask, did Saul suffer Samuel to beard him in the very presence of his army? Why did David abjectly obey the orders of Joab? Why did Ahab not dare to arrest Elijah at the door of Naboth's vineyard? *Because sin is weakness;* because there is in the world nothing so abject as a guilty conscience, nothing so invincible as the sweeping tide of a Godlike indignation against all that is base and wrong. How could these paltry sacrilegious buyers and sellers, conscious of wrong-doing, oppose that scathing rebuke, or face the lightnings of those eyes that were enkindled by an outraged holiness? When Phinehas the priest was zealous for the Lord of Hosts, and drove through the bodies of the prince of Simeon and the Midianitish women with one glorious thrust of his indignant spear, why did not guilty Israel avenge that splendid murder? Why did not every man of the tribe of Simeon become a *Goel* to the dauntless assassin? Because Vice cannot stand for one moment before Virtue's uplifted arm. Base and grovelling as they were, these money-mongering Jews felt in all that remnant of their souls which was not yet eaten away by infidelity and avarice, that the Son of Man was right.

Nay, even the Priests and Pharisees, and Scribes and Levites, devoured as they were by pride and formalism, could not condemn an act which might have been performed by a Nehemiah or a Judas Maccabæus, and which agreed with all that was purest and best in their traditions.[1] But when they had heard of this deed, or witnessed it, and had time to recover from the breathless mixture of admiration, disgust, and astonishment which it inspired, they came to Jesus, and though they did not dare to condemn what He had done, yet half-indignantly asked Him for some sign that He had a right to act thus.[2]

[1] *E.g.*, in the Rabbis we find R. Eliezer Ben Zadok severely blamed for practising merchandise in a synagogue which he himself had built at Alexandria (Sepp). Gfrörer has pointed out the remarkable fact that in the Targum of Jonathan, at the last verse of Zechariah (xiv. 21), the word "trader" is substituted for "Canaanite." "There shall be no more the trader in the house of the Lord." (Ebrard, *Gosp. Hist.*, E. Tr., p. 219.)

[2] "The Jews" in John ii. 18 means, as usual in this Gospel, "the opponents of Jesus." The term hardly occurs in the other Gospels, except in the title of the cross, "King of the Jews;" but to St. John "standing within the boundary of the Christian age, . . . the name appears to be the

Our Lord's answer in its full meaning was far beyond their comprehension, and in what *appeared* to be its meaning filled them with a perfect stupor of angry amazement. "Destroy," He said, "this Temple,[1] and in three days I will raise it up."

Destroy this Temple! — the Temple on which a king pre-eminent for his wealth and magnificence had lavished his most splendid resources, and thereby almost reconciled the Jews to an intolerable tyranny; the Temple for the construction of which one thousand wagons had been required and ten thousand workmen enrolled, and a thousand priests in sacerdotal vestments employed to lay the stones which the workmen had already hewn; the Temple which was a marvel to the world for its colossal substructions of marble, its costly mosaics, its fragrant woods, its glittering roofs, the golden vine with its hanging clusters sculptured over the entrance door, the embroidered veils, inwoven with flowers of purple, the profuse magnificence of its silver, gold, and precious stones.[2] It had been already forty-six years in building and was yet far from finished; and this unknown Galilæan youth bade them destroy it, and *He* would raise it in three days! Such was the literal and evidently false construction which they chose to put upon His words, though

true antithesis to Christianity." (Westcott, s. v. "Jew" in Smith's *Dict. Bible.*)

[1] John ii. 19. More literally, "shrine" (ναὸν), not ἱερὸν as before in verse 14. Consequently the assertion of the Jews was not strictly accurate, for ὁ ναὸς οὗτος (as distinguished from τὸ ἱερὸν), with all its porticos, had been finished in eight or nine years. The Talmud (*Taanith*, f. 23 *a*) says that to aid the building, the rain which fell had been dried with miraculous quickness. The sign which Jesus gives is His prediction. Cf. Micaiah (1 Kings xxii. 24; Jer. xx. 1–6, etc.).

[2] See the elaborate and gloating description of Josephus (*Antt.* xv. 11, §§ 3–5). It appears, however, that the actual Holy Place — the ναὸς alone — had been "built by the priests in a year and six months" (*id.* 6). The expression of the Jews applied to the whole area with its splendid colonnades, royal citadel, etc. Josephus says (xv. 11, § 1) that Herod had begun the Temple in the eighteenth year of his reign — *i.e.* between Nisan 1, A.U.C. 734 and 735. This would give us A.U.C. 781–782, A.D. 28 or 29, for our Lord's first Passover; and as the Temple was begun in Kisleu, the exact date is probably A.D. 28. This agrees with the date given in Luke iii. 1, if we suppose that he dates from the first year of Tiberius's joint reign, as we seem entitled to infer from the evidence of coins, etc. (Wieseler, *Beiträge*, 177 ff.; see Sanday, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 65.) Similarly in Jos. *B. J.*, i. 21, § 1, Herod is said to have begun the Temple in the fifteenth year of his reign, which is no contradiction to *Antt.* xv. 11, § 1, the reign in the former instance being dated from the death of Augustus, in the latter from the confirmation of Herod by the Romans. The ᾠκοδομήθη seems to imply that the works were then *suspended* (cf. Ezra v. 16), but the whole was not *finished* till the time of Herod Agrippa II. (*Antt* xx. 9, § 7).

the recorded practice of their own great prophets might have shown them that a mystery lay hidden in this sign which He gave.[1]

How ineffaceable was the impression produced by the words is best proved by the fact that more than three years afterwards it was this, more than all His other discourses which His accusers and false witnesses tried to pervert into a constructive evidence of guilt; nay, it was even this, more than anything else, with which the miserable robber taunted Him upon the very cross. They were obliged, indeed, entirely to distort his words into "*I am able to destroy* the Temple of God,"[2] or "I *will destroy* this Temple made with hands, and in three days will build another."[3] He had never used these expressions, and here also their false witness was so self-contradictory as to break down. But they were well aware that this attempt of theirs to infuse a political and seditious meaning into what He said was best calculated to madden the tribunal before which He was arraigned: indeed, so well adapted was it to this purpose that the mere distant echo, as it were, of the same words was again the main cause of martyrdom to His protomartyr Stephen.[4]

"But he spake," says St. John, "of the temple of His body," and he adds that it was not until His resurrection that His disciples fully understood His words.[5] Nor is this astonishing, for they were words of very deep significance. Hitherto there had been but one Temple of the true God, the Temple in which he then stood — the Temple which symbolized, and had once at least, as the Jews believed, enshrined that Shechînah, or cloud of glory, which was the living witness to God's presence in the world. But now the Spirit of God abode in a Temple not made with hands, even in the sacred Body of the Son of God made flesh. He tabernacled among us; "He had a tent like ours and of the same material." Even this was to be done away. At that great Pentecost three years later, and thenceforward forever, the Holy Spirit of God was to prefer

"Before all temples the upright heart and pure."

Every Christian man was to be, in his mortal body, a temple of the Holy Ghost. This was to be the central truth, the sublimest privilege of the New Dispensation; this was to be

[1] See Isa. vii. 11, 14, etc.
[2] Matt. xxvi. 61.
[3] Mark xiv. 58.
[4] Acts vi. 14.
[5] Ps. xvi. 10; Hos. vi. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 4, etc.

the object of Christ's departure, and to make it "better for us that He should go away."

Nothing could have been more amazing to the carnal mind that walked by sight and not by faith — nothing more offensive to the Pharisaic mind that clung to the material — than this high truth, that his sacred Temple at Jerusalem was henceforth to be no longer, with any special privilege, the place where men were to worship the Father; that, in fact, it *was* the truest Temple no longer. Yet they might, if they had willed it, have had some faint conception of what Christ meant. They must have known that by the voice of John He had been proclaimed the Messiah; they might have realized what He afterwards said to them, that "in this place was one greater than the Temple;" they might have entered into the remarkable utterance of a Rabbi of their own class — an utterance involved in the prophetic language of Daniel ix. 24, and which they ought therefore to have known — that the true Holy of Holies was the Messiah Himself.

And in point of fact there is an incidental but profoundly significant indication that they *had* a deeper insight into Christ's real meaning than they chose to reveal. For, still brooding on these same words — the first official words which Christ had addressed to them — when Jesus lay dead and buried in the rocky tomb, they came to Pilate with the remarkable story, "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while He was yet alive, After three days I will rise again." Now there is no trace that Jesus had *ever* used any such words distinctly to them; and unless they had heard the saying from Judas, or unless it had been repeated by common rumor derived from the Apostles — *i.e.*, unless the "we remember" was a distinct falsehood — they could have been referring to no other occasion than this. And that they should have heard it from any of the disciples was most unlikely; for over the slow hearts of the Apostles these words of our Lord seem to have passed like the idle wind. In spite of all that He had told them there seems to have been nothing which they expected *less* than His death, unless it were His subsequent resurrection. How then came these Pharisees and Priests to understand better than His own disciples what our Lord had meant? Because they were not like the Apostles, loving, guileless, simple-hearted men; because, in spite of all their knowledge and insight, their hearts were even already full of the hatred and rejection which ended in Christ's murder, and which drew the guilt of His blood on the heads of them and of their children.

But there was yet another meaning which the words involved, not indeed less distasteful to their prejudices, but none the less full of warning, and more clearly within the range of their understandings. The Temple was the very heart of the whole Mosaic system, the headquarters, so to speak, of the entire Levitical ceremonial. In profaning that Temple, and suffering it to be profaned — in suffering One whom they chose to regard as only a poor Galilæan teacher to achieve that purification of it which, whether from supineness, or from self-interest, or from timidity, neither Caiaphas, nor Annas, nor Hillel, nor Shammai, nor Gamaliel, nor Herod, had ventured to attempt — were they not, as it were, destroying that Temple, abrogating that system, bearing witness by their very actions that for them its real significance had passed away? "Finish, then,"[1] he might have implied, at once by way of prophecy and of permission, "finish without delay this your work of dissolution: in three days will I, as a risen Redeemer, restore something better and greater; not a material Temple, but a living Church." Such is the meaning which St. Stephen seems to have seen in these words. Such is the meaning which is expanded in so many passages by the matchless reasoning and passion of St. Paul. But to this and every meaning they were deaf, and dull, and blind. They seem to have gone away silent indeed, but sullen and dissatisfied; suspicious of, yet indifferent to, the true solution; ignorant, yet too haughty and too angry to inquire.

What great works Jesus did on this occasion we cannot tell. Whatever they were, they caused some to believe on Him; but it was not as yet a belief in which He could trust. Their mere intellectual witness to His claims He needed not; and their hearts, untouched as yet, were, as He knew by divine insight, cold and barren, treacherous and false.[2]

[1] John ii. 19, Λύσατε. It is obviously hypothetic. Cf. Matt. xii. 33.
[2] John ii. 23–25.

CHAPTER XIV.

NICODEMUS.

Ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.— JOHN iii. 10.

A CASTE or a sect may consist for the most part of haughty fanatics and obstinate bigots, but it will be strange indeed if there are to be found among them no exceptions to the general characteristics; strange if honesty, candor, sensibility, are utterly dead among them all. Even among rulers, scribes, Pharisees, and wealthy members of the Sanhedrin, Christ found believers and followers. The earliest and most remarkable of these was Nicodemus, a rich man, a ruler, a Pharisee, and a member of the Sanhedrin.[1]

A constitutional timidity is, however, observable in all which the Gospels tell us about Nicodemus; a timidity which could not be wholly overcome even by his honest desire to befriend and acknowledge One whom he knew to be a Prophet, even if he did not at once recognize in Him the promised Messiah. Thus the few words which he interposed to check the rash injustice of his colleagues are cautiously rested on a general principle, and betray no indication of his personal faith in the Galilæan whom his sect despised. And even when the power of Christ's love, manifested on the cross, had made the most timid disciples bold, Nicodemus does not come forward with his splendid gifts of affection until the example had been set by one of his own wealth, and rank, and station in society.[2]

[1] Matt. ix. 18; Mark xii. 28. Strauss considers this conversation with Nicodemus to have been invented to show that the followers of Jesus were not all obscure and poor! But the Fathers and early Christians considered it to be their glory, not their reproach, that to the poor the Gospel was preached (see 1 Cor. i. 26–29). It is with no touch of regret that Jerome writes, "Ecclesia Christi non de Academiâ, et Lycaeo, sed *de vili plebeculâ* congregata est" (Comm. in Gal. iii. 3).

[2] John vii. 50; xix. 39. I have borrowed a few words from my article on "Nicodemus" in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*. The name, which seems to have been not uncommon among the Jews (Jos. *Antt.* xiv. 3, § 2), is doubtless, like so many Jewish names at this period, derived from the Greek. In the Talmud it appears under the form of Nakdîmôn, and some would derive it from *nakí*, "innocent," and *dam*, "blood." (See Wetstein, *N. T.* i. 150.) Tradition says that after the Resurrection (which would

Such was the Rabbi who, with that mingled candor and fear of man which characterize all that we know of him, came indeed to Jesus, but came cautiously by night. He was anxious to know more of this young Galilæan prophet whom he was too honest not to recognize as a teacher come from God; but he thought himself too eminent a person among his sect to compromise his dignity, and possibly even his safety, by visiting Him in public.

Although he is alluded to in only a few touches, because of that high teaching which Jesus vouchsafed to him, yet the impression left upon us by his individuality is inimitably distinct, and wholly beyond the range of invention. His very first remark shows the indirect character of his mind — his way of suggesting rather than stating what he wished — the half-patronizing desire to ask, yet the half-shrinking reluctance to frame his question — the admission that Jesus had come "from God," yet the hesitating implication that it was only as "a teacher," and the suppressed inquiry, "What must I do?"

Our Lord saw deep into his heart, and avoiding all formalities or discussion of preliminaries, startles him at once with the solemn uncompromising address, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again (or 'from above'),[1] he cannot see the kingdom of God." My disciple must be mine in heart and soul, or he is no disciple at all; the question is not of doing or not doing, but of *being*.

That answer starled Nicodemus into deep earnestness; but like the Jews in the last chapter (ii. 20), he either could not, or would not, grasp its full significance. He prefers to play, with a kind of querulous surprise, about the mere literal

supply the last outward impulse necessary to confirm his faith and increase his courage) he became a professed disciple of Christ, and received baptism from Peter and John; that the Jews then stripped him of his office, beat him, and drove him from Jerusalem; that his kinsman Gamaliel received and sheltered him in his country house till death, and finally gave him honorable burial near the body of St. Stephen. If he be identical with the *Nakdimôn Ben Gorion* of the Talmud, he outlived the fall of Jerusalem, and his family were reduced from wealth to such horrible poverty that, whereas the bridal bed of his daughter had been covered with a dower of 12,000 denarii, she was subsequently seen endeavoring to support life by picking the grains from the ordure of cattle in the streets. (*Gittin*, f. 56, 1; *Kethubh.*, f. 66, 2, quoted by Otho, *Lex Rabb.* s.v.)

[1] The two meanings do not exclude each other. St. John elsewhere always uses ἄνωθεν in the sense of "from above" (i. 13; 1 John ii. 29; iii. 9; iv. 7: comp. James i. 17); on the other hand, it is clear that Nicodemus here understood Christ to mean also "a second birth" (ver. 4; and cf. Gal. vi. 15; 1 Pet. i. 3, 23); and as our Lord probably spoke in Aramaic, and there is, according to Grotius, *no* Aramaic word which has both meanings, Alford is doubtless right in making it = ἀναγεννᾶσθαι.

meaning of the words which he chooses to interpret in the most physical and unintelligible sense. Mere logomachy like this Jesus did not pause to notice; He only sheds a fresh ray of light on the reiteration of his former warning. He spoke, not of the fleshly birth, but of that spiritual regeneration of which no man could predict the course or method, any more than they could tell the course of the night breeze that rose and fell and whispered fitfully outside the little tabernacle where they sat,[1] but which must be a birth by water and by the Spirit — a purification, that is, and a renewal — an outward symbol and an inward grace — a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness.

Nicodemus could only answer by an expression of incredulous amazement. A Gentile might need, as it were, a new birth when admitted into the Jewish communion; but he — a son of Abraham, a Rabbi, a zealous keeper of the law — could *he* need that new birth? How could such things be?

"Art thou *the* teacher (ὁ διδάσκαλος) of Israel," asked our Lord, "and knowest not these things?"[2] Art thou the third member of the Sanhedrin, the *châkâm* or wise man, and yet knowest not the earliest, simplest lesson of the initiation into the kingdom of heaven? If thy knowledge be thus carnal, thus limited — if thus thou stumblest on the threshold, how canst thou understand those deeper truths which He only who came down from heaven can make known? The question was half sorrowful, half reproachful; but He proceeded to reveal to this Master in Israel things greater and stranger than these; even the salvation of man rendered possible by the sufferings and exaltation of the Son of Man;[3] the love of God manifested in sending His

[1] That this was the character of the allusion seems to be implied in the use of τὸ πνεῦμα, "the breeze," rather than ὁ ἄνεμος, "the wind." *Ruach* in Hebrew, no less than πνεῦμα in Greek, means both spirit and wind. This is, indeed, the only place in the N.T. where πνεῦμα is used in this sense; but it is found in the LXX. (Gen. viii. 1; Wisd. v. 23), and the quotation in Heb. i. 7. But to make it mean as many do, "The Spirit breathes where it wills," etc., gives an inferior sense. The meaning is, "The wind breatheth where it listeth; so *it is with* every one born of the Spirit." Alford refers to other instances of the same idiom.

[2] This may, perhaps, be the meaning. The president of the Sanhedrin was called the *Nasî* (הַנָּשִׂיא); the vice-president was called Father of the House of Judgment (אֲבִי בֵית דִּין); the third member, who sat on the president's left, bore the title of *châkâm*, or "wise man" (חָכָם). On the other hand, ὁ διδάσκαλος *may* be merely generic = "one of οἱ διδασκαλοι." Cf. Gal. iv. 2.

[3] The ὑψωθῆναι (ver. 14) is both literal and metaphorical — uplifted on the cross, exalted to the kingdom. Cf. Gen. xl. 13; John xii. 32; and ἀπαρθῇ (Luke v. 35).

only-begotten Son, not to judge, but to save;[1] the deliverance for all through faith in Him; the condemnation which must fall on those who wilfully reject the truths He came to teach.

These were indeed the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven — truths once undreamed of, but now fully revealed. And although they violated every prejudice, and overthrew every immediate hope of this aged inquirer — though to learn them he must unlearn the entire intellectual habits of his life and training — yet we know from the sequel that they must have sunk into his inmost soul. Doubtless in the further discussion of them the night deepened around them; and in the memorable words about the light and the darkness with which the interview was closed, Jesus gently rebuked the fear of man which led this great Rabbi to seek the shelter of midnight for a deed which was not a deed of darkness, needing to be concealed, but which was indeed a coming to the true and only Light.

Whatever lessons were uttered, or signs were done during the remainder of this First Passover, no further details are given us about them. Finding a stolid and insensate opposition, our Lord left Jerusalem, and went with His disciples "into Judæa," apparently to the banks of the Jordan, for there St. John tells us that His disciples began to baptize.[2] This baptism, a distant foreshadowing of the future sacrament, Christ seems rather to have permitted than to have directly organized. As yet it was the time of Preparation; as yet the inauguration of His ministry had been, if we may be allowed the expression, of an isolated and tentative description. Theologians have sought for all kinds of subtle and profound explanations of this baptism by the disciples. Nothing, however, that has been suggested throws any further light upon the subject, and we can only believe that Jesus permitted for a time this simple and beautiful rite as a sign of discipleship and as the national symbol of a desire for that lustration of the heart which was essential to all who would enter into the kingdom of heaven.

[1] The change from ἵνα κρίνῃ (act.) to ἵνα σώθῃ (pass.) indicates that in this great salvation man's free will must take a part. Alford, whose notes on this chapter are specially good, points out in verse 20 the remarkable variation from ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων to ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν (cf. v. 29, οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες — οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες), as indicating the *transient and worthless result* of evil, and the *permanent effect* of good.

[2] He would not *Himself* baptize; the reasons for this would be analogous to those which prevented St. Paul from frequently baptizing, but far deeper and more peremptory.

John the Baptist was still continuing his baptism of repentance. Here, too, theologians have discovered a deep and mysterious difficulty, and have entered into elaborate disquisitions on the relations between the baptism of Jesus and of John. Nothing, however, has been elicted from the discussion.[1] Inasmuch as the full activity of Christ's ministry had not yet begun, the baptism of St. John no less than that of the disciples must be still regarded as a symbol of repentance and purity. Nor will any one who is convinced that Repentance is "the younger brother of Innocence," and that for all who have sinned repentance is the very work of life, be surprised that the earliest preaching of Jesus as of John was — "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." [2] The time of preparation, of preliminary testing, was not over yet; it was indeed drawing to a conclusion, and this baptism by the disciples was but a transitory phase of the opening ministry. And the fact that John no longer preached in the wilderness, or baptized at Bethany, but had found it desirable to leave the scene of his brief triumph and glory, marked that there was a waning in the brightness of that star of the Gospel dawn. The humble spirit of John — in all of whose words a deep undertone of sadness is traceable — accepted, in entire submissiveness to the will of God, the destiny of a brief and interrupted mission.

He had removed to Ænon, near Salim, a locality so wholly uncertain that it is impossible to arrive at any decision respecting it.[3] Some still came to his baptism, though probably in diminished numbers, for a larger multitude now began to flock to the baptism of Christ's disciples. But the ignoble jealousy which could not darken the illuminated soul of the Forerunner, found a ready place in the hearts of

[1] Tert., *De Baptismo*, xi.; Calvin, *Institt.*, cc. 15, 18; Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Alter der Jüdischen Proselyten-taufe*; Wall, *Hist. of Inf. Bapt.*; R. Hall, *Works*, ii. 175 seqq., etc. — Ewald thinks that the baptism of the disciples only differed from that of John in the two respects that — (i.) it was now directed to Jesus definitely as the Messiah to whom John had borne witness; and (ii.) that it was an initiation not into painful penitences, but into a life of divine joy and love (*Gesch. Christ.*, p. 345).

[2] Matt. xviii. 3; Mark i. 15.

[3] Jerome, and the great majority of inquirers, place it near Beth-shean, or Scythopolis, in the valley of the Jordan, where there were ruins called Salumias, and a spring. The objection to this is that it would be in the limits of Samaria. Robinson (iii. 298) found a Salim east of Nablous. Others have fancied they found places which might answer the description near Hebron (cf. Josh. xv. 32); and even at Wady Seleim, five miles N.E. of Jerusalem. The identification of the site is of no great importance for the narrative.

his followers. How long it may have smouldered we do not know, but it was called into active display during the controversy excited by the fact that two great Teachers, of whom one had testified to the other as the promised Messiah, were baptizing large multitudes of people, although the Sanhedrin and all the appointed authorities of the nation had declared against their claims. Some Jew[1] had annoyed the disciples of John with a dispute about purification, and they vented their perplexed and mortified feelings in a complaint to their great master: "Rabbi, He who was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou hast borne witness,[2] lo, *He* is baptizing, and all men are coming to him." The significant suppression of the name, the tone of irritation at what appeared to them an encroachment, the scarcely subdued resentment that any one should be a successful rival to him whose words had for a season so deeply stirred the hearts of men, are all apparent in this querulous address. And in the noble answer to it, all John's inherent greatness shone forth. He could not enter into rivalries, which would be a treachery against his deepest convictions, a falsification of his most solemn words. God was the sole source of human gifts, and in His sight there can be no such thing as human greatness. He reminded them of his asseveration that he was *not* the Christ, but only His messenger; he was not the bridegroom, but the bridegroom's friend, and his heart was even now being gladdened by the bridegroom's voice. Henceforth he was content to decrease; content that his little light should be swallowed up in the boundless Dawn. He was but an earthly messenger; but he had put the seal of his most intense conviction to the belief that God was true, and had given all things to His Son, and that through Him alone could eternal life be won.

[1] μετὰ Ἰουδαίου, "with *a Jew*," seems to be undoubtedly the right reading in John iii. 25. (ℵ, A, B, L, etc.)

[2] μεμαρτύρηκας, a perfect tense (John iii. 26).

CHAPTER XV.

THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA.

"In templo vis orare? in te ora, sed prius esto templum Dei." — Aug.

The Jew whose discussions had thus deeply moved the followers of John may well have been one of the prominent Pharisees; and our Lord soon became aware that they were watching his proceedings with an unfriendly eye. Their hostility to John was a still deeper hostility against Him, for the very reason that His teaching was already more successful. Perhaps in consequence of this determined rejection of the earliest steps of His teaching — perhaps also out of regard for the wounded feelings of John's followers — but most of all because at this very time the news reached Him that John had been seized by Herod Antipas and thrown into prison — Jesus left Judæa, and again departed into Galilee.[1] Being already in the north of Judæa, He chose the route which led through Samaria. The fanaticism of Jewish hatred, the fastidiousness of Jewish Pharisaism, which led His countrymen when travelling alone to avoid that route, could have no existence for Him, and were things rather to be discouraged than approved.

Starting early in the morning, to enjoy as many as possible of the cool hours for travelling, He stopped at length for rest and refreshment in the neighborhood of Sychar,[2] a

[1] The first reasons are emphasized by John (iv. 2, 3), the latter by Matt. iv. 12; Mark i. 14. For the imprisonment of John, *vid. infra*, Chap. XX. (see pp. 289, seqq.). The Synoptists markedly make the imprisonment of John the beginning of the Galilæan ministry, but the Fourth Gospel supplies the hiatus which they leave.

[2] The town of Shechem (cf. iv. 5 with Gen. xxxiii. 19; xlviii. 22, "one portion," LXX. Σικιμα ἐξαίσετον) — the modern Nablûs (Neapolis) corresponds to the description here given of Sychar; and if we imagine that the city extended a little farther eastward than at present, it is not so far from the well as to render it unlikely that the women of the city would sometimes resort to it for the cool and sacred water. From what the name of Sychar is derived is uncertain. The word λεγόμενος in St. John seems to imply a *sobriquet* (xi. 16; xx. 24; xix. 13). It may be שֶׁקֶר (*sheker*), "a lie," alluding to the false worship of the Temple on Gerizim; or שִׁכּוֹר (*shikkôr*), "drunken," alluding to Isa. xxviii. 1; or סוּכָר (*súkar*), "a sep-

city not far from the well in the fertile district which the partiality of the patriarch Jacob had bequeathed to his favorite son. The well, like all frequented wells in the East, was doubtless sheltered by a little alcove, in which were seats of stone.

It was the hour of noon,[1] and weary as He was with the long journey, possibly also with the extreme heat, our Lord sat "thus" on the well. The expression in the original is most pathetically picturesque. It implies that the Wayfarer was quite tired out, and in His exhaustion flung His limbs wearily on the seat, anxious, if possible, for complete repose. His disciples — probably the two pairs of brothers whom He had called among the earliest, and with them the friends Philip and Bartholomew — had left him, to buy in the neighboring city what was necessary for their wants; and, hungry and thirsty, He who bore all our infirmities sat wearily awaiting them, when His solitude was broken by the approach of a woman. In a May noon in Palestine the heat may be indeed intense,[2] but it is not too intense to admit of

ulchre," alluding to Joseph's tomb, which is close by (Josh. xxiv. 32). If the designation were common, St. John might use it without any shadow of scorn; or, again, Sychar may possibly have been a village [πόλις is very loosely used; thus Capernaum in the Gospels is called πόλις, though Josephus only calls it a village, κώμη] nearer the well than Sichem, on the site of the village now called El Askar, a name which Mr. Thomson says (*The Land and the Book*, ii. 220) may very easily have been corrupted from Sychar. (See, too, Keim, iii. 15, 16.)

[1] I must here repeat that I see no sufficient reason for supposing that St. John adopts a different computation of hours from that of the other Evangelists. If it had been evening, there would have been many women at the well instead of one; and, as Alford observes, St. John, if he had *meant* six in the evening, would have naturally specified whether he meant six A.M. or P.M. It is a pity that such a notion has ever been started. Rettig, followed by Olshausen, Meyer, Tholuck, etc., *assumed* that the Romans had a civil day, the same as the modern. Hug attempted, but quite failed, to prove it. Wieseler, acknowledging that there is no evidence of any such civil reckoning, appeals to the fact that for *scientific* purposes the *hora aequinoctialis* (*i.e.* the twenty-fourth part of a νυχθήμερον) was recognized (*e.g.* by Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* ii. 79), and concludes from internal evidence — but, as it seems to me, quite unnecessarily — that St. John *must* have done so (*Synops.*, pp. 377 ff., E. Tr.). Ewald also adopts this view in a more summary way (*Gesch. Christ.*, pp. 323, 573; *Alterthümer*, p. 452), though he admits that Josephus (*Vit.* 54) and Philo (*Opp.* i., p. 692) have no such reckoning. Townson conjectured, without sufficient proof, that St. John had found this mode of reckoning in use at Ephesus. St. John reckoned his hours from sunrise, as did the rest of mankind till the fifth century, so far as we know. (See p. 122.)

[2] It is not possible to determine at what time of the year this incident took place. Those who take John iv. 35 literally, suppose that it was in December; those who take verse 36 literally, place it in May. Now one of the two must be metaphorical, and how shall we decide which? Each supposition is surrounded with difficulties; but as the baptizing period seems to have been extremely short, and as the Passover in this year was

moving about; and this woman, either from accident, or, possibly, because she was in no good repute, and therefore would avoid the hour when the well would be thronged by all the women of the city,[1] was coming to draw water. Her national enthusiasm and reverence for the great ancestor of her race, or perhaps the superior coolness and freshness of the water, may have been sufficient motive to induce her to seek this well, rather than any nearer fountain.[2] Water in the East is not only a necessity, but a delicious luxury, and the natives of Palestine are connoisseurs as to its quality.

Jesus would have hailed her approach. The scene, indeed, in that rich green valley, with the great cornfields spreading far and wide, and the grateful shadow of trees, and the rounded masses of Ebal and Gerizim rising on either hand, might well have invited to lonely musing; and all the associations of that sacred spot — the story of Jacob, the neighboring tomb of the princely Joseph, the memories of Joshua, and of Gideon, and the long line of Israelitish kings — would supply many a theme for such meditations. But the Lord was thirsty and fatigued, and having no means of reaching the cool water which glimmered deep below the well's mouth, He said to the woman, "Give me to drink."

Every one who has travelled in the East knows how glad and ready is the response to this request. The miserable Fellah, even the rough Bedawy, seems to feel a positive pleasure in having it in his power to obey the command of his great prophet, and share with a thirsty traveller the priceless element. But so deadly was the hatred and rivalry between Jews and Samaritans, so entire the absence of all familiar intercourse between them, that the request only elicited from the woman of Samaria an expression of surprise that it should have been made.[3]

in April, there is possibly a shade more likelihood that it took place in May. If so, "Say ye not, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest," must be understood as being merely a proverbial expression of the average interval between seed-time and harvest in some parts of Palestine; for which proverb there are parallels both in Hebrew and classic literature.

[1] Gen. xxiv. 11.

[2] πηγῇ (John iv. 6). φρέαρ (ver. 12).

[3] οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται (*i.e.*, hold no *familiarity* with) Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρείταις (John iv. 9); see Ezra iv. 1. Even our Lord speaks of a Samaritan as ἀλλογενής (Luke xvii. 18). The Jews called them Cuthites; coupled the name of "Samaritan" with "devil;" accused them of worshipping the carrings and idolatrous amulets buried by Jacob under the Allonmeonenim or "Enchanter's Oak" (Gen. xxxv. 4); cursed them in their synagogues; did not suffer them to become proselytes; said that to eat their bread was like eating swine's flesh; and denied them all share in the resurrection The Samaritans, on their part, were accused of waylaying Jews; of mis-

Gently, and without a word of rebuke, our Lord tells her that had she known Him, and asked of Him, He would have given her living water.[1] She pointed to the well, a hundred feet deep. He had nothing to draw with: whence could He obtain this living water? And then, perhaps with a smile of incredulity and national pride, she asked if He were greater than their father Jacob, who had digged and drunk of that very well.[2] And yet there must have been something which struck and overawed her in his words, for now she addresses Him by the title of respect which had been wanting in her first address.

Our Lord is not deterred by the hard literalism of her reply; He treats it as He had treated similar unimagina-

leading them by false fire-signals; and of having scattered bones in the Temple (Jos. *Antt.* xx. 6, § 1; xviii. 2, § 2). "Are you a Jew?" asked Salameh Cohen, the Samaritan high priest, of Dr. Frankl; "and do you come to us, the Samaritans, who are despised by the Jews?" (*Jews in the East*, ii. 329.) He added that they would willingly live in friendship with the Jews, but that the Jews avoided all intercourse with them. Soon after, visiting the Sepharedish Jews of Nablous, Dr. Frankl asked one of that sect, "if he had any intercourse with the Samaritans. The women retreated with a cry of horror, and one of them said, 'Have you been among the worshippers of the pigeon?' I said that I had. The women again fell back with the same expression of repugnance, and one of them said, '*Take a purifying bath!*'" (id. p. 334). I had the pleasure of spending a day among the Samaritans encamped on Mount Gerizim for their annual passover, and neither in their habits nor apparent character could I see any cause for all this horror and hatred.

[1] Not far from Jacob's well — which is one of the very few precise spots in Palestine actually and closely identified by probability, as well as by unanimous tradition, with our Saviour's presence — there gushes a sweet and abundant stream. The fact that even the close vicinity of the fountain should not have been enough to render needless the toil of Jacob in digging the well — which is of immense depth — forcibly illustrates the jealousy and suspicion that marked his relations to the neighboring Canaanites. I sat by Jacob's well at noon one April day in 1870, hot and thirsty and tired. The well is now dry, and in fact all that can be seen of it is a pit some twenty feet deep; the true well, or at any rate the mouth of it, having been filled up with masses of rubble and masonry from the basilica once built over it. Captain Anderson descended it to a depth of seventy-five feet, and it may have been twice that depth originally (*Work in Palestine*, p. 201). Riding on to the stream, I asked for some water, and, to my extreme surprise, for it never happened on any other occasion, was refused. I can only suppose that the cup which the Arab had in his hand was in some way sacred, and he did not wish it to be touched by a *Nusrâny*.

[2] Josephus (*Antt.* ix. 14, § 3; xi. 8, § 6; xii. 5, § 5) says that the Samaritans were fond of appealing to their descent from Jacob when the Jews were in prosperity, but denied all relationship when the Jews were in adversity. The son of Sirach calls them "the foolish people (ὁ λαὸς ὁ μωρὸς) that dwelleth in Shechem." Wetstein thinks that this was a play on the ancient name *Moreh*. "There be two manner of nations which my heart abhorreth, and the third is no nation: they that sit upon the mountain of Samaria, and they that dwell among the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwell in Sichem" (Ecclus. l. 25, 26).

tive dulness in the learned Nicodemus, by still drawing her thoughts upward, if possible, to a higher region. She was thinking of common water, of which he who drinketh would thirst again; but the water He spake of was a fountain within the heart, which quenched all thirst forever, and sprung up unto eternal life.[1]

She becomes the suppliant now. He had asked her a little favor, which she had delayed, or half declined; He now offers her an eternal gift. She sees that she is in some great Presence, and begs for this living water, but again with the same unspiritual narrowness — she only begs for it that she might thirst no more, nor come there to draw.

But enough was done for the present to awake and to instruct this poor stranger, and abruptly breaking off this portion of the conversation, Jesus bids her call her husband, and return. All that was in His mind when He uttered this command we cannot tell; it may have been because the immemorial decorum of the East regarded it as unbecoming, if not as positively wrong, for any man, and above all for a Rabbi, to hold conversation with a strange woman; it may have been also to break a stony heart, to awake a sleeping conscience. For she was forced to answer that she had no husband, and our Lord, in grave confirmation of her sad confession, unbared to her the secret of a loose and wanton life. She had had five husbands, and he whom she now had was not her husband.[2]

She saw that a Prophet was before her, but from the facts of her own history — on which she is naturally anxious to linger as little as possible — her eager mind flies to the one great question which was daily agitated with such fierce passion between her race and that of Him to whom she spake, and which lay at the root of the savage animosity with which they treated each other. Chance had thrown her into the society of a great Teacher: was it not a good opportunity to settle forever the immense discussion between Jews and Samaritans as to whether Jerusalem or Gerizim was the holy place of Palestine — Jerusalem, where Solomon had built his

[1] Cf. Isa. xii. 3. The water is always there; what is wanting is the sacred thirst. "Ubi sitis recurrit, hominis, non aquae defectus est." (Bengel.)

[2] Keim, and many others, think it indisputable that this is an allegorical reference to the five religions brought by the Asiatic settlers into Samaria, and the hybrid Jehovism into which they were merged! Strange that an allusion so superfluously dim should have been made at all! If the Gospels were only intelligible to those who could guess the solution of such enigmas, the study of them might well be discredited altogether.

temple; or Gerizim, the immemorial sanctuary, where Joshua had uttered the blessings, and where Abraham had been ready to offer up his son?[1] Pointing to the summit of the mountain towering eight hundred feet above them, and crowned by the ruins of the ancient temple of Manasseh, which Hyrcanus had destroyed, she put her dubious question, "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, and ye say that Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship?"[2]

Briefly, and merely by way of parenthesis, He resolved her immediate problem. As against the Samaritans, the Jews were unquestionably right. Jerusalem was the place which God had chosen; compared to the hybrid and defective worship of Samaria, Judaism was pure and true;[3] but before and after touching on the earthly and temporal controversy, He uttered to her the mighty and memorable prophecy, that the hour was coming, yea now was, when "neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem" should true worshippers worship the Father, but in every place should worship Him in spirit and in truth.

She was deeply moved and touched; but how could she, at the mere chance word of an unknown stranger, give up the strong faith in which she and her fathers had been born and bred? With a sigh she referred the final settlement of this and of every question to the advent of the Messiah;[4]

[1] Deut. xxvii. 4 (where they read Gerizim). Cf. Gen. xii. 7; xxxiii. 18; Deut. xii. 5; xi. 29. See Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, pp. 236, 250, etc., ed. 1866; and the remarkable story in Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 4, § 1.

[2] Gen. xii. 6; xxxiii. 18, 20; Jos. *Antt.* xi. 8, § 4. Some have seen in the woman's question a mere desire to "turn the conversation," and to avoid the personal and searching topics to which it seemed likely to lead. Although there is no sign that her conscience was sufficiently moved to make this likely, we may doubtless see in what she says the common phenomenon of an intense interest in speculative and party questions combined with an utter apathy respecting moral obedience.

[3] John iv. 22, "*We* worship what we know; for salvation is of the Jews" (Isa. ii. 3; compare the phrase of Tacitus, preserved in Sulp. Severus, "Christianos ex Judaeis exstitisse"). It has been pointed out that such a sentence could not conceivably have been written by the Asiatic Gnostic to whom the school of Baur attribute the Fourth Gospel. "The ἡμεῖς is remarkable as being *the only instance* of our Lord thus speaking. . . . The nearest approach to it is Matt. xv. 24, 26" (Alford). Josephus preserves the striking fact that, down to the time of Alexander, the Temple on Gerizim *had no name* (*ἀνώνυμον ἱερόν*, *Antt.* xii. 5, § 5). The Samaritans actually proposed to Antiochus Epiphanes that it should be dedicated to Jupiter Hellenius.

[4] The Messianic hopes of the Samaritans were founded, not on the Prophets (whom they rejected), but on such passages as Gen. xlix. 10; Numb. xxiv. 17; Deut. xviii. 15. That they had hopes of a character more or less Messianic is independently proved by Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 4, § 1; and both Simon Magus and Dositheus may fairly be regarded as false Messiahs. Yet Sir R. Hanson (*Jesus of History*, pp. 82-85) relies on the supposed

and then He spake the simple, awful words — "I that speak unto thee am He."

His birth had been first revealed by night to a few unknown and ignorant shepherds; the first full, clear announcement by Himself of His own Messiahship was made by a well-side in the weary noon to a single obscure Samaritan woman. And to this poor, sinful, ignorant stranger had been uttered words of immortal significance, to which all future ages would listen, as it were, with hushed breath and on their knees.

Who would have *invented*, who would have merely *imagined*, things so unlike the thoughts of man as these?[1]

And here the conversation was interrupted; for the disciples — and among them he who writes the record — returned to their Master. Jacob's well is dug on elevated ground, on a spur of Gerizim, and in a part of the plain unobstructed and unshaded by trees or buildings. From a distance in that clear air they had seen and had heard their Master in long and earnest conversation with a solitary figure. He a Jew, He a Rabbi, talking to "a woman," and that woman a Samaritan, and that Samaritan a sinner![2] Yet they dared not suggest anything to Him; they dared not question Him. The sense of His majesty, the love and the faith His very presence breathed, overshadowed all minor doubts or wondering curiosities.

Meanwhile the woman, forgetting even her water-pot in her impetuous amazement, had hurried to the city with her wondrous story. Here was one who had revealed to her the very secrets of her life. Was not this the Messiah?

absence of Messianic expectations in Samaria as one argument against the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel (see Sanday, p. 88). It is true that the Tirithaba impostor is not said by Josephus (*l. c.*) to have called himself a Christ; but this silence would prove little. Ewald (*Gesch. Christ.* 174, 349) seems to feel a needless difficulty here. If Hausrath (*Neutest. Zeitgesch.*) were right in dating the disturbance about this time, the woman's remark would be still more natural; but probably this event was six or seven years after this date.

[1] A somewhat similar story occurs in the life of Ananda, the favorite disciple of Buddha; but I feel a strong conviction that some of these Buddhist stories are simply distorted echoes of the Gospel interpolated into the Lalita Vistara (see Beal's *Travels of Fah Hian and Sung Yun*, pp. lxxii., lxxiii.), and that others are merely accidental resemblances.

[2] John iv. 27, ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει, "that he was talking with *a* (not *the*) woman." To talk with a woman in public was one of the six things which a Rabbi might not do (*Berachôth*, fol. 43 *b*; Schwab, p. 404); even, adds R. Hisda, with his own wife. Here we have a curious accidental analogy between Pharisaism and Buddhism. In the *Vinaya* a *Bhikshu* is not only forbidden to look at or speak to a woman, but he may not hold out his hand to his own mother if she be drowning! (Wilson, *Essays on the Rel. of the Hindus*, i. 360.)

The Samaritans — in all the Gospel notices of whom we detect something simpler and more open to conviction than in the Jews — instantly flocked out of the city at her words, and while they were seen approaching,[1] the disciples urged our Lord to eat, for the hour of noon was now past, and He had had a weary walk. But all hunger had been satisfied in the exaltation of His ministry. "*I* have food to eat," He said, "which ye know not." Might they not have understood that, from childhood upwards, He had not lived by bread alone? But again we find the same dull, hard, stolid literalism. Their Scriptures, the very idiom in which they spoke, were full of vivid metaphors, yet they could hit on no deeper explanation of His meaning than that perhaps some one had brought Him something to eat.[2] How hard must it have been for Him thus, at every turn, to find even in His chosen ones such a strange incapacity to see that material images were but the vehicles for deep spiritual thoughts. But there was no impatience in Him who was meek and lowly of heart. "My meat," He said, "is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." And then pointing to the inhabitants of Sichem, as they streamed to Him over the plain, He continued, "You talk of there being yet four months to harvest. Look at these fields, white already for the spiritual harvest. Ye shall be the joyful reapers of the harvest which I thus have sown in toil and pain; but I, the sower, rejoice in the thought of that joy to come."[3]

The personal intercourse with Christ convinced many of these Samaritans far more deeply than the narrative of the woman to whom He had first revealed Himself; and graciously acceding to their request that He would stay with them, He and His disciples abode there two days. Doubtless it was the teaching of those two days that had a vast share in the rich conversions of a few subsequent years.[4]

[1] John iv. 30, ἐξῆλθον — ἤρχοντο.

[2] For similar literal misconstructions see John ii. 20; iii. 4; iv. 11; vi. 42–52; Matt. xvi. 6; Mark viii. 15. We shall meet with the metaphor again, and even the Rabbis said, "The just *eat* of the glory of the Shechînah," and that Moses in Horeb was *fed* by the music of the spheres (Philo, *De Somn.* i. 6).

[3] Josh. xxiv. 13. We have already seen that no certain note of time can be drawn from this allusion; He "in whom is no before or after" might also have seen by imagination the whitening harvest in the springing corn.

[4] Acts viii. 5.

SAMARIA.

CHAPTER XVI.

REJECTED BY THE NAZARENES.

οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον. — JOHN i. 11.

UP to this point of the sacred narrative we have followed the chronological guidance of St. John, and here, for the first time, we are seriously met by the difficult question as to the true order of events in our Lord's ministry.

Is it or is it not possible to construct a harmony of the Gospels which shall remove all the difficulties created by the differing order in which the Evangelists narrate the same events, and by the confessedly fragmentary character of their records, and by the general vagueness of the notes of time which they give, even when such notes are not wholly absent?

It is, perhaps, a sufficient answer to this question that scarcely any two authorities agree in the schemes which have been elaborated for the purpose. A host of writers, in all Christian nations, have devoted years — some of them have devoted well-nigh their whole lives — to the consideration of this and of similar questions, and have yet failed to come to any agreement or to command any general consent.

To enter into all the arguments, on both sides, about the numerous disputed points which must be settled before the problem can be solved, would be to undertake a task which would fill many volumes, would produce no final settlement of the difficulty, and would be wholly beyond the purpose before us. What I have done is carefully to consider the chief *data*, and without entering into controversy or pretending to remove all possible objections, to narrate the events in that order which, after repeated study, seems to be the most intrinsically probable, with due reference to all *definite* indications of time which the Gospels contain. An indisputable or convincing harmony of the Gospels appears to me to be impossible, and as a necessary consequence it can be of no absolute importance. Had it been essential to our comprehension of the Saviour's life that we should know more

exactly the times and places where the years of His public ministry were spent, the Christian at least will believe that such knowledge would not have been withheld from us.

The inspiration which guided the Evangelists in narrating the life of Christ was one which enabled them to tell all that was necessary for the peace and well-being of our souls, but very far from all which we might have yearned to know for the gratification of our curiosity, or even the satisfaction of our historic interest. Nor is it difficult to see herein a fresh indication that our thoughts must be fixed on the spiritual more than on the material — on Christ who liveth for evermore, and is with us always, even to the end of the world, far more than on the external incidents of that human life which, in the counsel of God's will, was the appointed means of man's redemption. We shall never know all that we could wish to know about·

> "The sinless years
> That breathed beneath the Syrian blue,"

but we shall still be the children of God and the disciples of His Christ if we keep His sayings and do the things which He commanded.

St. John tells us that after two days' abode among the open-minded Samaritans of Sychar, Jesus went into Galilee, "*for* He Himself testified that a prophet hath no honor in his own country," and yet he continues, that, "When He was come into Galilee, the Galilæans received Him, having seen all the things that He did at Jerusalem at the feast;" and he adds, immediately afterwards, that Jesus came again into Cana of Galilee, and there healed the nobleman's son. The perplexing "for" seems to point to one of those suppressed trains of thought which are so frequent in St. John. I understand it to mean that at Nazareth, in His own home, rejection awaited Him in spite of the first gleam of transient acceptance; and that for this rejection He was not unprepared, *for* it was one of His distinct statements that "in his own country a prophet is dishonored." [1]

[1] John iv. 43–45. The "*for*" seems at first sight to involve a contradiction, nor is it possible to make it mean "although." Some suppose the meaning to be that "He did *not* go to His own country, Nazareth, but to Cana and Capernaum" — which were in Upper Galilee, to which alone the name Galilee was properly applied (cf. Luke iv. 31; Matt. iv. 13, 15; Jos. *De Bell. Jud.* iii. 3, § 1) — "*for*," etc. And accordingly the *Galilæans*, properly so called, received him. [But this would make the καταλιπὼν of Matt. iv. 13 = παραλιπὼν.] Possibly, however, the particle may refer (as I have stated in the text) to a thought unexpressed in the writer's mind —

It was not the object of St. John to dwell on the ministry in Galilee, which had been already narrated by the Synoptists; accordingly it is from St. Luke that we receive the fullest account of our Lord's first public act in His native town.[1]

It appears that Jesus did not go direct from Sychar to Nazareth. On His way (unless we take Luke iv. 15 for a general and unchronological reference) He taught continuously, and with general admiration and acceptance, in the synagogues of Galilee.[2] In this way He arrived at Nazareth, and according to His usual custom, for He had doubtless been a silent worshipper in that humble place Sabbath after Sabbath from boyhood upwards, He entered into the synagogue on the Sabbath day.

There was but one synagogue in the little town,[3] and probably it resembled in all respects, except in its humbler aspect and materials, the synagogues of which we see the ruins at Tell Hûm and Irbid. It was simply a rectangular hall, with a pillared portico of Grecian architecture, of which the further extremity (where the "sanctuary" was placed) usually pointed towards Jerusalem, which, since the time of Solomon, had always been the *kibleh* — *i.e.*, the consecrated *direction* — of a Jew's worship, as Mecca is of a Mohammedan's. In wealthier places it was built of white marble, and sculptured on the outside in alto-relievo, with rude ornaments of vine-leaves and grapes, or the budding

viz., either that the reason *why He had declared Himself first in Judæa*, was that a prophet has no honor in his own country; or that "He was not unaware of the opposition which would await Him, for He knew that a prophet is least honored among his own." The *γάρ* may therefore point mentally to the very events which St. John omits, but which are narrated or alluded to in Luke iv. 14–30. "The causal connections in the Fourth Gospel," says Mr. Sanday (p. 98), "are often perplexing." Origen's solution that by *Ἰδία πατρὶς* is meant Judæa, is wholly unsatisfactory. That Christ did not *twice* preach at Nazareth under circumstances so closely analogous, I regard as certain, and that is my reason for considering that Matt. xiii. 53–58; Mark iv. 1–6, refer to this same event, narrated out of its proper order.

[1] Luke iv. 14–30. There *may possibly* (but not certainly) be some unchronological reminiscences of this visit to Nazareth in Matt. xiii. 54–58; Mark vi. 2–6.

[2] Luke iv. 15, *ἐδίδασκεν . . . δοξαζόμενος*. The old name for a synagogue was *Beth Tephillah*, or "House of Prayer;" but they are now called *Beth Hak-Kenéseth*, "House of Assembly." The hours of meeting were the 3d (*shacarith*), the 6th (*mincha*), and the 9th (*arâbith*) — *i.e.*, 9, 12, and 3. (Buxt. *De Synag. Jud.*, ch. x., p. 219, ed. 1661.) Without consulting the Latin treatises of Buxtorf, Vitringa, etc., the reader may find many of the most interesting facts about synagogues in the admirable articles on them by Prof. Plumptre (Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*) and Dr. Ginsburg (Kitto's *Bible Cyclop.*).

[3] Luke iv. 16, *εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν*.

rod and the pot of manna.[1] On entering there were seats on one side for the men; on the other, behind a lattice, were seated the women, shrouded in their long veils. At one end was the *tebhah* or ark of painted wood, which contained the sacred scriptures; and at one side was the *bîma*, or elevated seat for the reader or preacher.[2] Clergy, properly speaking, there were none, but in the chief seats were the ten or more *batlanîm*, "men of leisure," or leading elders;[3] and pre-eminent among these the chief of the synagogue,[4] or *rôsh hak-kenéseth*. Inferior in rank to these were the *chazzân*,[5] or clerk, whose duty it was to keep the sacred books; the *shelîach*, corresponding to our sacristan or verger; and the *parnasîm* or shepherds, who in some respects acted as deacons.

The service of the synagogue was not unlike our own. After the prayers[6] two lessons were always read, one from the Law called *parashah*, and one from the Prophets called *haphtarah;* and as there were no ordained ministers to conduct the services — for the office of priests and Levites at Jerusalem was wholly different — these lessons might not only be read by any competent person who received permission from the *rôsh hak-kenéseth*, but he was even at liberty to add his own *midrash*, or comment.[7]

The reading of the *parashah*, or lesson from the Pentateuch, was apparently over[8] when Jesus ascended the steps

[1] These emblems were found on the broken slab of the architrave which once stood over the door of the synagogue at Capernaum (Tell Hûm). They have no pretence to architectural beauty; "le goût en est assez mesquin" (Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 82, ed. pop.). For the reason of the *kibleh*, see 1 Kings viii. 29; Dan. vi. 10. The orientation does not now seem to be very carefully attended to, for Mr. Monro tells me that in Algiers the reader's pulpit in the synagogues may look north, east, or south — only not west.

[2] The Jews borrowed the word בימה from the Greek (but compare Neh. viii. 4; ix. 4).

[3] πρεσβύτεροι (Luke vii. 3); called also *zekênîm* (זקניב). Their "chief seats" (Mark xii. 39, etc.) were placed in front of the ark, and facing the congregation. In the synagogue at Alexandria were seventy-one golden arm-chairs, or seats of honor, for doctors and honorable men (Ginsburg, *l. c.*).

[4] ἀρχισυνάγωγος (Mark v. 22, etc.).

[5] ὑπηρέτης (Luke iv. 20).

[6] For the prayers, which consisted of the Hymnal group, the *Shema*, the 18 *Berachôth*, or Benedictions, etc., see a full account in Ginsburg, *l. c.*

[7] See, for these particulars, Surenhusius, *Mishna*, pp. 339, seqq.; Capecelatro, *Vita di Gesù Cristo*, i. 153; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, ii. 20. — Often the interpreter or expounder was a different person from the *maphtir*, or reader. The *Tôrah* rolls are now usually adorned with the *ets chajim*, or "tree of life" (Frankl, *Jews in the East*, ii. 17).

[8] This may, perhaps, be implied in the word ἐπεδόθη, was handed to Him in addition. (Wordsworth.)

of the *bîma*. Recognizing His claim to perform the honorable function of a *maphtîr* or reader, the *chazzân* drew aside the silk curtain of the painted ark which contained the sacred manuscripts, and handed Him the *megillah* or roll of the Prophet Isaiah, which contained the *haphtarah* of the day.[1] Our Lord unrolled the volume, and found the well-known passage in Isaiah lxi. The whole congregation stood up to listen to Him. The length of the *haphtarah* might be from three to twenty-one verses, but Jesus only read the first and part of the second;[2] stopping short, in a spirit of tenderness, before the stern expression, "The day of vengeance of our God," so that the gracious words, "The acceptable year[3] of the Lord," might rest last upon their ears and form the text of His discourse. He then rolled up the *megillah*, handed it back to the *chazzân*, and, as was customary among the Jews, sat down to deliver His sermon.[4]

[1] It appears that the Prophecy of Isaiah was generally written on a separate *megillah*. It would be necessary to find the place, because the scroll of the Prophets had only one roller, the Law had two; and "every hebdomadal lesson is unrolled from the right roller, and rolled on the left. Hence, when the scroll of the Law is opened on the next Sabbath, the portion appointed for the day is at once found." (Ginsburg, s.v. "Haphtarah," Kitto's *Cyclop.* ii. 224.)

[2] Probably it would be read in Hebrew, but translated by the *methurgeman* ("interpreter") either into Aramaic, which was then the vernacular of Palestine; or into Greek, which at that time seems to have been generally understood and spoken throughout the country. The passage, as given in St. Luke, agrees mainly with the LXX. or Greek version; but (as is almost invariably the case in the New Testament quotations from the Old Testament) with some remarkable differences. The deviations from the Hebrew original are at first sight considerable, though the main conception is the same. I do not know of any book where the reader will find a clearer and briefer comparison of the New Testament quotations with the original, with some explanation of the divergences between them, than in Mr. Turpie's *Old Testament in the New* (Williams and Norgate, 1868). Without binding myself by all Mr. Turpie's conclusions, I have found his book very useful.

[3] This expression led to the mistaken tradition of some Fathers [Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i., p. 147; Orig., *De Princ.* iv. 5; Tert. *C. Jud.* 8; Lactant. *Instt. Div.* iv. 10; Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 54; together with the Valentinians and the Alogi (see Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 21; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* i. 2, 10, etc.)] that our Lord's ministry lasted but for a single year. Some refer them to that great and beautiful section of His life known as "the Galilæan year." In all probability the expression "year" is merely general. Mr. Browne, in his *Ordo Saeclorum*, argues powerfully for the limitation of our Lord's ministry to a year; but the *three* passovers distinctly mentioned by St. John (without a single important variation in any MS., or version, or quotation by the Fathers in vi. 4) seem conclusive on the other side (John ii. 13; vi. 4; xi. 55); and this was the view of Melito, St. Hippolytus, St. Jerome, etc. (See Hase, *ubi supra;* Westcott, *Introd. to Gosp.*, p. 266.)

[4] This was our Lord's usual attitude when teaching (Matt. v. 1; Mark xiii. 3, etc.). Probably the audience, as well as the reader, stood at any rate during the reading of the Law (Neh. viii. 5). (Frankl, *ubi supr.*) The sermon was called *derash* (λόγος παρακλήσεως, Acts xiii. 15).

The passage which He had read, whether part of the ordinary lesson for the day or chosen by Himself,[1] was a very remarkable one, and it must have derived additional grandeur and solemnity from the lips of Him in whom it was fulfilled. Every eye in the synagogue was fixed upon Him with a gaze of intense earnestness,[2] and we may imagine the thrill of awful expectation and excitement which passed through the hearts of the listeners, as, in a discourse of which the subject only is preserved for us by the Evangelist, He developed the theme that He was Himself the Messiah, of whom the great Prophet had sung 700 years before.[3] His words were full of a grace, an authority, a power which was at first irresistible, and which commanded the involuntary astonishment of all. But as He proceeded He became conscious of a change. The spell of His wisdom and sweetness[4] was broken, as these rude and violent Nazarenes began to realize the full meaning of His divine claims. It was customary with the Jews in the worship of their synagogue to give full vent to their feelings, and it was not long before Jesus became sensible of indignant and rebellious murmurs. He saw that those eager glittering eyes, which had been fixed upon Him in the first excitement of attention, were beginning to glow with the malignant light of jealousy and hatred. "Is not this *the carpenter?* is He not the brother of workmen like himself — James and Joses and Simon and Judas — and of sisters who live among us? do not even his own family disbelieve in him?"[5] Such were the whispers which began to be buzzed about among the audience. This was no young and learned Rabbi[6] from the schools of Gamaliel or Shammai, and yet he spoke with an authority which not even the great scribes assumed! Even a Hillel, when his doctrines failed to persuade, could only secure conviction by appealing to the previous authority of a Shemaia

[1] It appears that this was admissible in the case of the lesson from the Prophets, though no one might select a passage alternative for the *parashah*. (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, *ad* Luke iv. 16.) In the list of Sabbatic and festival *parshiôth* and *haphtaróth*, Isa. lxi. 1 does not occur: but Isa. lxi. 10–lxiii. 9 was read on the 51st Sunday of the year (Ginsburg, s. v. "Haphtara;" Kitto, *Bib. Cycl.*; Deutsch, *Bible Dict.*, iii. 1639 *a*).

[2] Luke iv. 20, ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ.

[3] Luke iv. 18, οὗ ἕνεκεν ἔχρισέ με. "M'a messianisée" (Salvador, *Jésus Christ et sa Doctrine*).

[4] Cf. Ps. xlv. 2.

[5] Matt. xiii. 57, "and in his own house." Cf. John vii. 5; Mark iii. 21; Matt. xiii. 56.

[6] The title, together with that of "teacher," was however, freely allowed to Christ, even by His enemies (Matt. viii. 19; xii. 38; xxii. 16; xxiii. 7, etc.)

or an Abtalion. But *this* teacher appealed to no one — this teacher who had been but their village carpenter! What business had *he* to teach? Whence could he know letters, having never learned?[1]

Jesus did not leave unobserved the change which was passing over the feelings of His audience.[2] He at once told them that He *was* the Jesus whom they described, and yet with no abatement of His Messianic grandeur. Their hardness and unbelief had already depressed His spirit before He had even entered the synagogue. The implied slur on the humility of His previous life He passes by; it was too essentially provincial and innately vulgar to need correction, since any Nazarene of sufficient honesty might have reminded himself of the yet humbler origin of the great herdsman Amos. Nor would He notice the base hatred which weak and bad men always contract for those who shame them by the silent superiority of noble lives. But He was aware of another feeling in their minds; a demand upon Him for some stupendous vindication of His claims; a jealousy that He should have performed miracles at Cana, and given an impression of His power at Capernaum,[3] to say nothing of what He had done and taught at Jerusalem — and yet that He should have vouchsafed no special mark of His favor among them. He knew that the taunting and sceptical proverb, "Physician, heal thyself," was in their hearts, and all but on their lips.[4] But to show them most clearly that He was something more than they — that He was no mere Nazarene like any other who might have lived among them for thirty years, and that He belonged not to them but to the world[5] — He reminds them

[1] *Jer. Pesach.*, f. 33, 1; Derenbourg, *Hist. Pal.* 177, seqq.; Keim, *Gesch. Jes.* ii. 12. Cf. John vii. 15, etc.

[2] "The village beggarly pride of the Nazarenes cannot at all comprehend the humility of the Great One" (Stier *Reden Jesu*, E. Tr., iii. 446). Their remark savors of the notions of Shammai, who (in opposition to Hillel) held that no one ought even to be admitted into a school unless he was of good family and rich (*Abhôth de Rabbi Nathan*, ii.).

[3] These are unrecorded if our order is right; but remarkable instances of teaching and of powers quite sufficient to establish a strong expectation — especially when taken in connection with the miracle at Cana — may have occurred in the short interval mentioned in John ii. 12. Even at Nazareth it seems that some slight acts of healing, hardly regarded as miracles, had been performed (Mark vi. 5; Matt. xiii. 58). More than this He neither could nor would perform amid a faithless and hostile population.

[4] The proverb finds its analogy in all nations. It was afterwards addressed to Christ upon the cross.

[5] It has been conjectured that His recent favorable reception at Sychar would tend to prejudice the Nazarenes against Him.

that miracles are not to be limited by geographical relationships — that Elijah had only saved the Phœnician widow of Sarepta, and Elisha only healed the hostile leper of Syria.

What then? were they in *His* estimation (and He but "the carpenter!") no better than Gentiles and lepers? This was the climax of all that was intolerable to them, as coming from a fellow-townsman whom they wished to rank among themselves; and at these words their long-suppressed fury burst into a flame. The speaker was no longer interrupted by a murmur of disapprobation, but by a roar of wrath. With one of those bursts of sanguinary excitement which characterized that strange, violent, impassioned people — a people whose minds are swept by storms as sudden as those which in one moment lash into fury the mirror surface of their lake — they rose in a body,[1] tore Him out of the city, and then dragged Him to the brow of the hill above. The little town of Nazareth nestles in the southern hollows of that hill; many a mass of precipitous rock lies imbedded on its slopes, and it is probable that the hill-side may have been far more steep and precipitous two thousand years ago.[2] To one of these rocky escarpments they dragged Him, in order to fling Him headlong down.

But His hour was not yet come, and they were saved from the consummation of a crime which would have branded them with everlasting infamy. "He passed through the midst of them, and went on His way." There is no need to suppose an actual miracle; still less to imagine a secret and sudden escape into the narrow and tortuous lanes of the town. Perhaps His silence, perhaps the calm nobleness of His bearing, perhaps the dauntless innocence of His gaze overawed them. Apart from anything supernatural, there seems to have been in the presence of Jesus a spell of mystery and of majesty which even His most ruthless and hardened enemies acknowledged, and before which they involuntarily bowed. It was to this that He owed His

[1] Luke iv. 28, ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ, κ. τ. λ. Cf. Acts xxii. 22; xxviii. 25.

[2] Κατακρημνίσαι. The word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament or the LXX., except in 2 Chron. xxv. 12. Κατακρημνισμὸς was one form of stoning, which was the recognized legal punishment for blasphemy. The scene of this event was certainly not the "Mount of Precipitation," which was *much* beyond a Sabbath-day's journey, being at least two miles off. It may have been the cliff above the Maronite Church, which is about forty feet high. When I was at Nazareth, my horse was hurt, and might easily have been killed, by sliding down a huge mass of rock on the hill-side. What criminal would be hurt by a fall from the Tarpeian rock in its *present* condition?

escape when the maddened Jews in the Temple took up stones to stone Him; it was this that made the bold and bigoted officers of the Sanhedrin unable to arrest Him as He taught in public during the Feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem; it was this that made the armed band of His enemies, at His mere look, fall before Him to the ground in the garden of Gethsemane. Suddenly, quietly, He asserted His freedom, waved aside His captors, and overawing them by His simple glance, passed through their midst unharmed. Similar events have occurred in history, and continue still to occur. There is something in defenceless and yet dauntless dignity that calms even the fury of a mob. "They stood — stopped — inquired — were ashamed — fled — separated."[1]

And so He left them, never apparently to return again; never, if we are right in the view here taken, to preach again in their little synagogue. Did any feelings of merely human regret weigh down His soul while He was wending His weary steps[2] down the steep hill-slope towards Cana of Galilee? Did any tear start in His eye unbidden as He stood, perhaps for the last time, to gaze from thence on the rich plain of Esdraelon, and the purple heights of Carmel, and the white sands that fringe the blue waters of the Mediterranean? Were there any from whom He grieved to be severed, in the green secluded valley where His manhood had labored, and His childhood played? Did He cast one longing, lingering glance at the humble home in which for so many years He had toiled as the village carpenter? Did no companion of His innocent boyhood, no friend of His sinless youth, accompany Him with awe, and pity, and regret? Such questions are not, surely, unnatural; not, surely, irreverent; — but they are not answered. Of all merely human emotions of His heart, except so far as they directly affect His mission upon earth, the Gospels are silent.[3] We know

[1] Pfenninger, quoted by Stier, iii. 451. Cf. John vii. 30, 46; viii. 59; x. 39; xviii. 6. — Some of my readers may be aware of an instance in which a clergyman, still living, walked untouched through the very midst of a brutal and furious London mob, who had assembled for the express purpose of insulting and assaulting him. It was observed by more than one spectator, that if he had wavered for a single instant, or shown the slightest sign of fear and irresolution, he would in all probability have been struck down, and possibly have not escaped with his life.

[2] Luke iv. 30, *ἐπορεύετο*.

[3] Whole volumes must lie concealed in that memorable allusion of Heb. ii. 18 (*πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθείς*) and iv. 15 (*πεπειραμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα, κ. τ. λ.*).

only that henceforth other friends awaited Him away from boorish Nazareth, among the gentle and noble-hearted fishermen of Bethsaida; and that thenceforth His home, so far as He had a home, was in the little city of Capernaum, beside the sunlit waters of the Galilæan Lake.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE BEGINNING OF THE GALILÆAN MINISTRY.

πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται. — MATT. xi. 5.

REJECTED at Nazareth, our Lord naturally turned to the neighboring Cana, where His first miracle had been wrought to gladden friends. He had not long arrived when an officer from the neighboring court of Herod Antipas, hearing of His arrival, came and urgently entreated that He would descend to Capernaum and heal his dying son. Although our Lord never set foot in Tiberias, yet the voice of John had more than once been listened to with alarm and reverence in the court of the voluptuous king.[1] We know that Manaen, the foster brother of Herod, was in after days a Christian, and we know that among the women who ministered to Christ of their substance was Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward.[2] As this courtier (βασιλικός) believed in Christ with his whole house, in consequence of the miracle now wrought, it has been conjectured with some probability that it was none other than Chuza himself.

The imperious urgency of his request, a request which appears at first to have had but little root in spiritual conviction, needed a momentary check. It was necessary for Jesus to show that He was no mere *hakeem*, no mere benevolent physician, ready at any time to work local cures, and to place His supernatural powers at the beck and call of any sufferer who might come to Him as a desperate resource. He at once rebuked the spirit which demanded mere signs and prodigies as the sole possible ground of faith.[3] But yielding to the

[1] In the general obscurity of the chronology, it seems clear (as we have said before) that by *this* time John had been cast into prison (Matt. iv. 12, 13; Mark i. 14; Luke iii. 20). Comparing these passages of the Synoptists with John iii. 24; iv. 45, and following the order of events given in the text, we may perhaps assume (though this is not absolutely necessary, *v. supr.*, p. 172, *n.*) that Galilee here means *Northern* Galilee, or Galilee proper.

[2] Acts xiii. 1; cf. Luke viii. 3.

[3] τέρατα. This is a half-disparaging term for miracles, rarely used in the Gospels, and derived only from the sense of astonishment which they caused.

father's passionate earnestness, He dismissed him with the assurance that his son lived. The interview had taken place as the seventh hour — *i.e.*, at one o'clock in the day.[1] Even in the short November day it would have been still possible for the father to get to Capernaum; for if Cana be, as we believe, Kefr Kenna, it is not more than five hours' distance from Capernaum. But the father's soul had been calmed by faith in Christ's promise, and he slept that night at some intermediate spot upon the road.[2] The next day his slaves met him, and told him that, at the very hour when Jesus had spoken, the fever had left his son. This was the second time that Christ had signalized His arrival in Galilee by the performance of a conspicuous miracle. The position of the courtier caused it to be widely known, and it contributed, no doubt, to that joyous and enthusiastic welcome which our Lord received during that bright early period of His ministry, which has been beautifully called the "Galilæan spring."[3]

At this point we are again met with difficulties in the chronology, which are not only serious, but to the certain solution of which there appears to be no clew. If we follow exclusively the order given by one Evangelist, we appear to run counter to the scattered indications which may be found in another. That it should be so will cause no difficulty to the candid mind. The Evangelists do not profess to be scrupulously guided by chronological sequence. The pictures which they give of the main events in the life of Christ are simple and harmonious, and that they should be presented in an informal, and what, with reference to mere literary considerations, would be called inartistic manner, is not only in accordance with the position of the writers, but is an additional confirmation of our conviction that we are reading the records of a life which, in its majesty and beauty, infinitely transcended the capacities of invention or imagination in the simple and faithful annalists by whom it was recorded.

It was not, as we have already observed, the object of St. John to narrate the Galilæan ministry, the existence of which he distinctly implies (vii. 3, 4), but which had already been

[1] I here again (*v. supr.*, pp. 122, *n.*, 164, *n.*) assume that the hours, as mentioned by St. John, are calculated from sunrise, according to the *universal* custom of that day.

[2] Perhaps at Lubîyeh, or Hattîn.

[3] Ewald says that "no one can doubt" as to the identity of this incident with that narrated of the centurion's servant. It is, however, seriously doubted — nay, entirely disputed — by many of the ablest commentators, from Chrysostom down to Ebrard and Tischendorf.

fully recorded. Circumstances had given to the Evangelist a minute and profound knowledge of the ministry in Judæa, which is by the others presupposed, though not narrated.[1] At this point accordingly (iv. 54) he breaks off, and only continues the thread of his narrative at the return of Jesus to "a" or "the" feast of the Jews (v. 1). If the feast here alluded to were the feast of Purim, as we shall see is probably the case, then St. John here passes over the history of several months. We fall back, therefore, on the Synoptic Gospels for the events of the intervening ministry on the shores of Gennesareth. And since we have often to choose between the order of events as narrated by the three Evangelists, we must here follow that given by St. Luke, both because it appears to us intrinsically probable, and because St. Luke, unlike the two previous Evangelists, seems to have been guided, so far as his information allowed, by chronological considerations.[2]

It seems then, that after leaving Cana, our Lord went at once to Capernaum, accompanied apparently by His mother and His brethren, and made that town His home.[3] His sisters were probably married, and did not leave their native Nazareth; but the dreadful insult which Jesus had received would have been alone sufficient to influence His family to leave the place, even if they did not directly share in the odium and persecution which His words had caused. Perhaps the growing alienation between Himself and them may have been due, in part, to this circumstance. They must have

[1] Distinctly, for instance, in Matt. iv. 25; xxiii. 37, "*how often;*" xix. 1; Luke x. 38, etc., not to mention the extremely interesting and valuable reading of τῆς Ἰουδαίας for τῆς Γαλιλαίας in Luke iv. 44. This reading is found in ℵ, B, C, L, etc., and in the Coptic version. On the probable character of the reading, see Caspari, *Chronol. Geogr. Einleit.*, p. 111. If the abrupt transition to another scene in Luke v. 1 is against it, yet this very circumstance strengthens the *diplomatic* evidence in its favor. Spannheim well remarks, "Nihil frequentius quam quaedam praetermitti ab his, suppleri ab aliis. . . . ne vel scriptores sacri ex compacto scripsisse viderentur, vel lectores uni ab illis, spretis reliquis, haererent" (Wordsworth on Matt. v. 1).

[2] Luke i. 1–3.

[3] "His own city" (Matt. ix. 1; cf. Matt. xvii. 24). St. Matthew (iv. 15, 16) sees in this locality of the ministry an idealized fulfilment of Isa. ix. 1. The LXX. is here loose, and the quotation also differs from the Hebrew; less so, however, than might at first sight appear, because the "did more grievously afflict her" of the English Version (which would utterly contradict the purport of St. Matthew's allusion) should be rather, "made heavy," i.e., "*honored*," (*v. supr.*, pp. 178, 182; see Turpie, p. 226). "Way of the sea," because the great caravan road ran along its western shore. St. Luke alone calls the Sea of Galilee λίμνη, because he wrote for Gentiles. The Hebrews apply יָם to any water (1 Kings xviii. 43; Numb xxxiv. 11). "Beyond Jordan" perhaps refers to Peræa.

felt, and we know that they did feel, a deeply seated annoyance, if, refusing to admit the full awfulness of His mission, and entirely disapproving the form of its manifestation, they yet felt themselves involved in hatred and ruin as a direct consequence of His actions. Certain it is that, although apparently they were living at Capernaum, *their* home was not *His* home. Home, in the strict sense, He had none; but the house of which He made ordinary use appears to have been that which belonged to His chief apostle. It is true that Simon and Andrew are said to have belonged to Bethsaida, but they may easily have engaged the use of a house at Capernaum, belonging to Peter's mother-in-law; or, since Bethsaida is little more than a suburb or part of Capernaum, they may have actually moved for the convenience of their Master from the one place to the other.

The first three Evangelists have given us a detailed account of the Lord's first Sabbath at Capernaum, and it has for us an intrinsic interest, because it gives us one remarkable specimen of the manner in which He spent the days of His active ministry. It is the best commentary on that epitome of His life which presents it to us in its most splendid originality — that "He went about doing good." It is the point which the rarest and noblest of His followers have found it most difficult to imitate; it is the point in which His life transcended most absolutely the ideal of the attainments of His very greatest forerunners. The seclusion of the hermit, the self-maceration of the ascetic, the rapture of the mystic — all these are easier and more common than the unwearied toil of a self-renouncing love.

The day began in the synagogue, perhaps in the very building which the Jews owed to the munificence of the centurion proselyte. If Capernaum were indeed Tell Hûm, then the white marble ruins which still stand on a little eminence above the sparkling lake, and still encumber the now waste and desolate site of the town with their fragments of elaborate sculpture, may possibly be the ruins of this very building. The synagogue, which is not very large, must have been densely crowded; and to teach an earnest and expectant crowd — to teach as He taught, not in dull, dead, conventional formulæ, but with thoughts that breathed and words that burned — to teach as they do who are swayed by the emotion of the hour, while heart speaks to heart — must have required no slight energy of life, must have involved no little exhaustion of the physical powers. But this was

not all. While He was speaking, while the audience of simple-hearted yet faithful, intelligent, warlike people were listening to Him in mute astonishment, hanging on His lips with deep and reverential admiration — suddenly the deep silence was broken by the wild cries and obscene ravings of one of those unhappy wretches who were universally believed to be under the influence of impure spirits, and who — in the absence of any retreat for such sufferers — had, perhaps, slipped in unobserved among the throng.[1] Even the poor demoniac, in the depths of his perturbed and degraded nature, had felt the haunting spell of that pure presence, of that holy voice, of that divine and illuminating message. But, distorted as his whole moral being was, he raved against it, as though by the voices of the evil demons who possessed him, and while he saluted "Jesus the Nazarene" as the Holy One of God, yet, with agonies of terror and hatred, demanded to be let alone, and not to be destroyed.

Then followed a scene of thrilling excitement. Turning to the furious and raving sufferer, recognizing the duality of his consciousness, addressing the devil which seemed to be forcing from him these terrified ejaculations, Jesus said, "Hold thy peace,[2] and come out of him." He never ac-

[1] Luke iv. 33, "A spirit of an unclean devil," "cried with a loud voice;" cf. Mark i. 23. The ἔα is, perhaps, not "desist! let us alone!" but a wild cry of horror, the Hebr. אֲחָה; so Stier, iii. 378. The Jews, like most ancient nations, attributed every evil result immediately to the action of demons, *e.g.*, even Noah's drunkenness. In Ps. xci. 6, the LXX. renders "the destruction that wasteth at noonday," by μεσημβρινὰ δαιμόνια. These mid-day demons are called טיהרין, Targ. Cant. iv. 6. If a woman does not cover her head, demons sit upon her hair. If you do not wash your hands before meals, you become the victim of a demon, *Shibta*. "If a bull rushes at you in the field," says the Talmud, "Satan leaps up from between his horns." All mental aberration, all sudden sickness, all melancholy tendencies, all unexpected obstacles, were, and in the East still are, regarded as due to the direct influence of demons (*devs*). These demons they believed to be the spirits of the wicked (Jos. *B. J.* vii. 6, § 3). Such instances of the Jewish belief might be indefinitely multiplied, and that they shared it with the majority of mankind may be seen in Mr. E. B. Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, *passim*. That they regarded as demoniacal possession what we regard as epilepsy and mania is certain. This is indeed clear from the passage of Josephus to which I have just referred, but the real controversy turns on the question whether much more than this is not possible, and whether in the days of Christ much more than this was not a common phenomenon. It is not one of those questions which seem to me to be of vital importance, and dogmatism on either side must be left to those who think it necessary. The reader may find the entire question as to the *actuality*, or the mere *semblance* of, and *belief in*, demoniacal possession, fully argued on both sides, with much acuteness and impartiality in Jahn *Archæologia Biblica*, E. Tr., 3d edn., pp. 200–216.

[2] φιμώθητι (Luke iv. 35). A strong word, meaning literally "be thou

cepted or tolerated this ghastly testimony to His origin and office. The calm, the sweetness, the power of the divine utterance were irresistible. The demoniac fell to the ground in a fearful paroxysm, screaming and convulsed. But it was soon over. The man arose cured; his whole look and bearing showed that he was dispossessed of the over-mastering influence, and was now in his right mind. A miracle so gracious and so commanding had never before been so strikingly manifested, and the worshippers separated with emotions of indescribable wonder.[1]

Rising from the seat of the *maphtîr* in the synagogue, Christ retired into the house of Simon. Here again He was met by the strong appeal of sickness and suffering. Simon, whom He had already bound to Himself on the banks of the Jordan, by the first vague call to his future Apostolate, was a married man,[2] and his wife's mother lay stricken down by a violent access of fever.[3] One request from the afflicted family was sufficient: there was no need, as in the case of the more worldly nobleman, for importunate entreaty.[4] He

muzzled" (cf. Acts xvi. 18). Those who reject the reality of demoniacal possession, and therefore regard the action as a figurative concession to the sufferer's delusions, appeal to such expressions as Matt. viii. 26; Luke iv. 39. On this doctrine of "accommodation," see Suidas s.v. Συγκατάβασις; Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes*, i. 98. Although it is a principle which has received the sanction of some very eminent Fathers, it must be applied with the most extreme caution.

[1] It is worth while to set side by side with this an instance of exorcism, such as was commonly practised by Jews at this very period (cf. Matt. xii. 27; Mark ix. 38; Acts xix. 13), the invention of which Josephus attributes to Solomon, and which he tells us he had himself witnessed. He says that he had seen a Jew named Eleazar casting out demons in the presence of Vespasian, Titus, their officers and army. His method was to draw the demoniac out through the nostrils by a ring and a particular root. Hereupon the man fell down, and Eleazar, with various incantations and in the name of Solomon, adjured the demon not to return. And then, in proof that the cure was effectual, he put a basin of water a little way off, and bade the demon, as he departed, to overturn it! (Jos. *Antt.* viii. 2, § 5). For the root employed see *id. B. J.* vii. 6, § 3. Josephus was a man of astute mind and liberal experience, familiar with heathen culture, and a constant denizen of courts and camps. The Evangelists, on the other hand, were simple, untrained, and ignorant men; yet to what scorn would they have been subjected — how would their credulity and superstition have been derided — if they had told the story of such an exorcism as *this!* And if this was the current mode, we may the better understand the profound sensation caused in the minds of the spectators by the effect of Christ's simple word.

[2] Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 5.

[3] Luke iv. 38, *συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ.*

[4] *Id.* 38, *ἠρώτησαν* (implying a single and instantaneous act), not *ἠρώτα*, as in John iv. 47. A careful comparison of this or any similar narrative in the three Synoptists (Matt. viii. 14, 15; Mark i. 29–31; Luke iv. 38, 39) will show the inquirer more clearly the resemblances and the differences in the

stood over her; He took her by the hand; He raised her up; He rebuked the fever; His voice, stirring her whole being, dominated over the sources of disease, and, restored instantaneously to health, she rose and busied herself about the household duties.[1]

Possibly the strictness of observance which marked the Jewish Sabbath secured for our Lord a brief interval for refreshment; but no sooner did the sun begin to set, than the eager multitude, barely waiting for the full close of the Sabbath hours, began to seek His aid. The whole city came densely thronging round the doors of the humble home, bringing with them their demoniacs and their diseased. What a strange scene! There lay the limpid lake, reflecting in pale rose-color the last flush of sunset that gilded the western hills; and here, amid the peace of Nature, was exposed, in hideous variety, the sickness and misery of man, while the stillness of the Sabbath twilight was broken by the shrieks of demoniacs who testified to the Presence of the Son of God.[2]

> "A lazar-house it seemed, wherein were laid
> Numbers of all diseased; all maladies
> Of ghastly spasm, and racking tortures, qualms
> Of heart-sick agony, all feverous kinds,
> Demoniac frenzy, moping melancholy
> And moonstruck madness;"

and amidst them all, not

> "Despair
> Tended the sick, busiest from couch to couch,
> And over them triumphant Death his dart
> Shook,"

but far into the deepening dusk, the only person there who was unexcited and unalarmed — hushing by His voice the delirium of madness and the screams of epilepsy,[3] touching disease into health again by laying on each unhappy and tortured[4] sufferer His pure and gentle hands — moved, in His love and tenderness, the young Prophet of Nazareth, the Christ, the Saviour of the world. Unalarmed indeed, and

descriptions of the same event, than any number of disquisitions. Often it is only by combining the three independent testimonies that we get a clear and graphic picture.

[1] This is involved in the aorists and imperfects: *ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει* (Luke iv. 39), *ἠγέρθη καὶ διηκόνει* (Matt. viii. 15).

[2] Luke iv. 40, *ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις.*

[3] Matt. iv. 24, *σεληνιαζομένους.*

[4] Matt. iv. 24, *βασάνοις συνεχομένους.*

unexcited, but not free from sorrow and suffering. For sympathy is nothing else than a fellow-feeling with others; a sensible participation in their joy or woe. And Jesus was touched with a feeling of their infirmities. Those cries pierced to His inmost heart; the groans and sighs of all that collective misery filled His whole soul with pity: He bled for them; He suffered with them; their agonies were His; so that the Evangelist St. Matthew recalls and echoes in this place, with a slight difference of language, the words of Isaiah, "Surely He bore our griefs and carried our sorrows."[1]

The fame of that marvellous day rang through all Galilee and Peræa, and even to the farthest parts of Syria,[2] and we might well have imagined that the wearied Saviour would have needed a long repose. But to Him the dearest and best repose was solitude and silence, where He might be alone and undisturbed with His heavenly Father. The little plain of Gennesareth was still covered with the deep darkness which precedes the dawn,[3] when, unobserved by all, Jesus rose and went away to a desert place, and there refreshed His spirit with quiet prayer. Although the work which He was sent to do obliged Him often to spend His days amid thronging and excited multitudes, He did not love the tumult, and avoided even the admiration and gratitude of those who felt in His presence a spring of life. But He was not suffered thus to remain, even for a brief period, in rest and seclusion. The multitude sought Him persistently: Simon and his friends almost hunted for Him in their eager desire to see and to hear. They even wished to detain Him among them by gentle force.[4] But He quietly resisted their importunity. It was not His object to become the centre of an admiring populace, or to spend His whole time in working miracles, which, though they were deeds of mercy, were mainly intended to open their hearts to His diviner teaching. His blessings were not to be confined to Capernaum. Dalmanutha, Magdala, Bethsaida, Chorazin were all near at hand. "Let us go," He said, "to the adjoining country towns[5] to preach the kingdom of God there also; for therefore am I sent."

[1] Matt. viii. 17, ἔλαβε, ἐβάστασε; Isa. liii. 4 (cf. ἀνήνεγκεν, 1 Pet. ii. 24). The LXX. reads ἁμαρτίας for ἀσθενείας, and makes the sympathy more purely mental (ὀδυνᾶται περὶ ἡμῶν). Though no word of the LXX. is found in St. Matthew's quotation, yet he gives one of the possible senses of the original.

[2] Matt. iv. 24.

[3] Mark i. 35, πρωῒ ἔννυχον λίαν. One of the many little graphic touches, derived doubtless from the Apostle St. Peter, in which the Gospel of St. Mark abounds.

[4] Luke iv. 42, ἐπεζήτουν, κατεῖχον; Mark i. 36, κατεδίωξαν.

[5] Mark i. 38, κωμοπόλεις. Cf. Luke iv. 43.

It is doubtful, however, whether Jesus put His intention into instant effect. It seems as if He so far yielded to the anxiety of the multitude as to give them one more address before He set forth to preach in that populous neighborhood.[1] He bent His steps towards the shore, and probably to the spot where the little boats of His earliest disciples were anchored, near the beach of hard white sand which lines the water-side at Bethsaida. At a little distance behind Him followed an ever-gathering concourse of people from all the neighborhood; and while He stopped to speak to them, the two pairs of fisher-brethren, Simon and Andrew, and James and John, pursued the toils by which they earned their daily bread. While Jesus had retired to rest for a few short hours of the night, Simon and his companions, impelled by the necessities of a lot which they seem to have borne with noble-minded cheerfulness, had been engaged in fishing; and, having been wholly unsuccessful, two of them, seated on the shore — probably, in that clear still atmosphere, within hearing of His voice — were occupying their time in washing, and two, seated in their boat with their hired servants, and Zebedee, their father, were mending their nets.[2] As Jesus spoke, the multitude — some in their desire to catch every syllable that fell from the lips of Him who spake as never man spake, and some in their longing to touch Him, and so be healed of whatever plagues they had — thronged upon Him closer and closer, impeding his movements with dangerous and unseemly pressure.[3] He therefore beckoned to Simon to get into his boat and push it ashore, so that He might step on board of it, and teach the people from thence. Seated in this pleasant pulpit, safe from the inconvenient

[1] I must again remark that while adopting the order which appears to me most probable, and which in this part of the narrative is that given by St. Luke, and is followed (among other eminent authorities) by Lange, repeated examination has convinced me of the utter impossibility of any certainty about the *exact* sequence of events. The data of time are far too vague to admit of definiteness in the chronological arrangement.

[2] I have here attempted to combine, as far as it is *possible*, in one continuous narrative, the perfectly comprehensible, but slightly differing accounts of the Synoptists (Matt. iv. 18–22; Mark i. 16–20; Luke v. 1–11). Let me remark — (1) that any one whose faith is shaken by the so-called "discrepancies" of these and similar stories must (*a*) either hold some very rigid, untenable, and superstitious view of inspiration, or (*b*) be wholly unacquainted with the different aspects assumed by perfectly truthful but confessedly fragmentary testimonies; and (2) that the very variety in the narratives, being in no respect inconsistent with essential and truthful unity, is a valuable proof of the independence of the Gospel witnesses.

[3] See Mark iii. 9–12.

contact with the multitude, He taught them from the little boat as it rocked on the blue ripples, sparkling in the morning sun. And when His sermon was over, He thought not of Himself and of His own fatigue, but of His poor and disappointed disciples. He knew that they had toiled in vain; He had observed that even while He spoke they had been preparing for some future and more prosperous expedition; and with a sympathy which never omitted an act of kindness, He ordered Peter to push out his boat into the deep, and all of them to cast out their nets once more.[1] Peter was in a despondent mood; but the mere word of One whom he so deeply reverenced, and whose power he had already witnessed, was sufficient. And his faith was rewarded. Instantly a vast haul of fishes crowded into the nets.

A busy scene followed. The instinct of work first prevailed. Simon and Andrew beckoned to Zebedee and his sons and servants to come in their boat and help to save the miraculous draught and straining nets; both boats were filled to the gunwale with the load; and at the first moment that the work was finished, and Peter recognized the whole force of the miracle, he falls, with his usual eager impetuosity, at his Master's feet — to thank Him? to offer Him henceforth an absolute devotion? — No; but (and here we have a touch of indescribable truthfulness, utterly beyond the power of the most consummate intellect to have invented) to exclaim, "DEPART FROM ME, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!"[2] A flash of supernatural illumination had revealed to him both his own sinful unworthiness and who HE was who was with him in the boat. It was the cry of self-loathing which had already realized something nobler. It was the first impulse of fear and amazement, before they had had time to grow into adoration and love. St. Peter did not *mean* the "Depart from me;" he only meant — and this was known to the Searcher of hearts — "I am utterly unworthy to be near Thee, yet let me stay." How unlike was this cry of his passionate and trembling humility to the bestial ravings of the unclean spirits, who bade the Lord to let them alone, or to the hardened degradation of the filthy Gadarenes, who preferred to the presence of their Saviour the tending of their swine!

And how gently the answer came: "Fear not; from hence-

[1] Luke v. 4, ἐπανάγαγε . . . χαλάσατε.

[2] It is ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλὸς (Luke v. 8), a confession of individual guilt; not ἄνθρωπος. Comp. Exod. xx. 18, 19; Judg. xiii. 22; 1 Kings xvii. 18; Dan. x. 17; Isa. vi. 5.

forth thou shalt catch men." Our Lord, as in all His teaching, seized and applied with exquisite significance the circumstances of the moment. Round them in the little boat lay in heaps the glittering spoil of the lake — glittering, but with a glitter that began to fade in death.[1] Henceforth that sinful man, washed and cleansed, and redeemed and sanctified, was to chase, with nobler labor, a spoil which, by being entangled in the Gospel net, would not die, but be saved alive.[2] And his brother, and his partners, they, too, were to become "fishers of men." This final call was enough. They had already been called by Jesus on the banks of Jordan; they had already heard the Baptist's testimony; but they had not yet been bidden to forsake all and follow Him; they had not yet grown familiar with the miracles of power which confirmed their faith; they had not yet learned fully to recognize that they who followed Him were not only safe in His holy keeping, but should receive a thousandfold more in all that constitutes true and noble happiness even in this life — in the world to come, life everlasting.

We have already seen that, at the very beginning of His ministry, our Lord had prepared six of His Apostles for a call to His future service; four of whom were on this occasion bidden not only to regard Him as their Master, but henceforth to leave all and follow Him. There was but one other of the Apostles who received a separate call — the Evangelist St. Matthew. His call, though narrated in different sequences by each of the Synoptists, probably took place about this time.[3] At or near Capernaum there was a receipt of custom. Lying as the town did at the nucleus of roads which diverged to Tyre, to Damascus, to Jerusalem, and to

[1] Hence the extreme frequency of the fish as a symbol of Christians in early Christian art and literature. "Nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθῦν nostrum (Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν Θεοῦ υἱὸν Σωτῆρα) in aquâ (sc. baptismi) nascimur." (Tert. *De Bapt.* 1.)

[2] Luke v. 10, ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν. The word ζωγρεῖν, from ζῶος and ἀγρεύω, means "to take alive;" see Jos. *Antt.* xiii. 6, § 2. Those who had been ἐζωγρημ ——, "taken alive" in the deadly snare (παγὶς) of the devil (2 Tim. ii. 26), should henceforth be gathered in the net of life. "The Fathers," says Bishop Wordsworth, "call Peter the σύμβολον πρακτικῆς and John the σύμβολον θεωρίας, and infer that the practical must precede the contemplative life."

[3] By St. Matthew himself, after the Sermon on the Mount, the miracle of the Gadarene demoniacs, and the cure of the man sick of the palsy (ix. 9); by St. Mark, after the cure of the paralytic, but some time before the visit to Gergesa (ii. 14); by St. Luke after the cure of the paralytic, but before the choice of the Twelve, and before the Sermon on the Mount (v. 27). It seems, however, to have been the wish of all three to narrate it in immediate connection with the feast which he gave in Christ's honor; but it does not follow that the feast was given *immediately* after his call.

Sepphoris, it was a busy centre of merchandise, and therefore a natural place for the collection of tribute and taxes. These imposts were to the Jews pre-eminently distasteful. The mere fact of having to pay them wounded their tenderest sensibilities. They were not only a badge of servitude; they were not only a daily and terrible witness that God seemed to have forsaken His land, and that all the splendid Messianic hopes and promises of their earlier history were merged in the disastrous twilight of subjugation to a foreign rule which was cruelly and contemptuously enforced; but, more than this, the mere payment of such imposts wore almost the appearance of apostasy to the sensitive and scrupulous mind of a genuine Jew.[1] It seemed to be a violation of the first principles of the Theocracy, such as could only be excused as the result of absolute compulsion. We cannot, therefore, wonder that the officers who gathered these taxes were regarded with profound dislike. It must be remembered that those with whom the provincials came in contact were not the Roman knights — the real *publicani*, who farmed the taxes — but were the merest subordinates, often chosen from the dregs of the people, and so notorious as a class for their malpractices, that they were regarded almost with horror, and were always included in the same category with harlots and sinners. When an occupation is thus despised and detested, it is clear that its members are apt to sink to the level at which they are placed by the popular odium. And if a Jew could scarcely persuade himself that it was right to *pay* taxes, how much more heinous a crime must it have been in his eyes to become the questionably honest instrument for *collecting* them? If a publican was hated, how still more intense must have been the disgust entertained against a publican who was also a Jew?[2]

[1] Deut. xvii. 15; Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 2, § 1. "If we can imagine an Irish Roman Catholic in Ireland undertaking the functions of a Protestant tithe proctor, we can realize the detestation in which the publicans were held." (See Prof. Plumptre, Art. "Publican," Smith's *Bibl. Dict.*) These, however, are the *Socii*, or "subordinates," not the "*Mancipes*," who were people of some distinction (Cic. *Pro Plancio*, ix.). Honesty among them was considered so rare that, according to Suetonius, several cities erected statues to Sabinus, "the honest publican" (*Vesp.* i.). Lucian places them only in the worst company round the tribunal of Minos (*Menip.* ii.). But although Matthew held a disreputable office, we may wholly deny the remarks of Ep. Barn. 5 (*ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους*); and Cels. *Ap. Orig.* ii. 46 (*τοὺς ἐξωλεστάτους μόνους εἶλε*).

[2] The title "publican," as a term of opprobrium, was so thoroughly proverbial that, if we may trust the exact report of His words, it was even used in that sense by our Lord Himself: "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican" (Matt. xviii. 17). The Jews had a proverb,

But He who came to seek and save the lost — He who could evoke Christian holiness out of the midst of heathen corruption — could make, even out of a Jewish publican, the Apostle and the first Evangelist of a new and living Faith. His choice of apostles was dictated by a spirit far different from that of calculating policy or conventional prudence. He rejected the dignified scribe (Matt. viii. 19); He chose the despised and hated tax-gatherer. It was the glorious unworldliness of a Divine insight and a perfect charity, and St. Matthew more than justified it by turning his knowledge of writing to a sacred use, and becoming the earliest biographer of his Saviour and his Lord.

No doubt Matthew had heard some of the discourses, had seen some of the miracles of Christ. His heart had been touched, and to the eyes of Him who despised none and despaired of none, the publican, even as he sat at "the receipt of custom,"[1] was ready for the call. One word was enough. The "Follow me" which showed to Matthew that his Lord loved him, and was ready to use him as a chosen instrument in spreading the good tidings of the kingdom of God, was sufficient to break the temptations of avarice and the routine of a daily calling, and "he left all, rose up, and followed Him," touched into noblest transformation by the Ithuriel-spear of a forgiving and redeeming love.[2]

"Take not a wife out of the family where there is a publican, for they are all publicans." The Gentiles did not think much better of them, *πάντες τελῶναι, πάντες εἰσὶν ἁρπαγες* (Xeno. *Ap. Dicaearch. de Vit. Graec.*, p. 29). Theocritus, in answer to the question, which were the worst kind of wild beasts, said, "On the mountains, bears and lions; in cities, publicans and pettifoggers" (Muson. *Ap. Stob.*). Suidas, s.v. *τελώνης*, defines the life as *ἀνεπιτιμητος ἁρπαγὴ, ἀναισχυντὸς πλεονεξία, πραγμάτεια λόγον μὴ ἔχουσα, ἀναιδὴς ἐμπορία.* (Cave, *Lives of the Apostles.*)

[1] This "receipt of custom" is said to have been at the seaside; hence, in the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, "publican" is rendered בעל עברה, "lord of the passage." The publicans are said to have delivered to those who paid toll, a ticket to free them on the other side. (Buxtorf, *Lex.* s.v. מוכס; Cave, *Lives of the Apostles.*)

[2] It is here assumed that Matthew is identical with Levi, although Ewald, on insufficient grounds, denies it (*Gesch. Christus*, 364, 367). The *λεγόμενον* of Matt. ix. 9 implies a change of name. His name may have been changed by Christ, perhaps, in part to obliterate the painful reminiscences of his late discreditable calling. The name Matthew (if with Gesenius we regard it as equivalent to Mattithjah) means, like Nathanael and Theodore, "gift of God." (Ewald connects it with Amittai, *Gramm.* § 273 *e*; but in *Gesch. Christ.*, p. 397, he says that *Matthias* = Mattijah, and *Matthew* = Mattai, which occurs, by a misreading, as *Nittai* among Christ's disciples in *Chagigah* 2, 2, and is an abbreviation of Mattaniah.) If the Evangelist himself naturally prefers this name, whereas St Mark and St. Luke call him by the name which he bore when he received Christ's summons, on the other hand we should note the touching humility with which he alone of the Evangelists gives to himself in the list of the Apostles (x. 3) the dishonorable title of "publican."

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE TWELVE, AND THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

"Ante Christi adventum Lex jubebat non juvabat; post et jubet, et juvat." — AUGUSTINE.

AFTER one of His days of loving and ceaseless toil, Jesus, as was His wont, found rest and peace in prayer. "He went out into a mountain" — or, as it should rather be rendered, into *the* mountain[1] — "to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God." There is something affecting beyond measure in the thought of these lonely hours; the absolute silence and stillness, broken by no sounds of human life, but only by the hooting of the night-jar or the howl of the jackal; the stars of an Eastern heaven raining their large lustre out of the unfathomable depth; the figure of the Man of Sorrows kneeling upon the dewy grass, and gaining strength for His labors from the purer air, the more open heaven, of that intense and silent communing with His Father and His God.[2]

The scene of this lonely vigil, and of the Sermon on the Mount, was in all probability the singular elevation known at this day as the Kurn Hattîn, or "Horns of Hattîn."[3] It is a hill with a summit which closely resembles an Oriental saddle with its two high peaks. On the west it rises very little above the level of a broad and undulating plain; on the east it sinks precipitately towards a plateau, on which lies, immediately beneath the cliffs, the village of Hattîn;

[1] In Luke vi. 12, τὸ ὄρος is clearly specific, though elsewhere it only means the hill districts.

[2] "In solitudine aer purior, caelum apertius, familiarior Deus" (Orig.). (Jer. Taylor, *Life of Christ*, I. § viii. 5.) — It is a mistake of Mede, Hammond, etc., to suppose that ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ can mean "in a proseucha," or oratory (cf. Acts xvi. 13; Juv. iii. 296, "In quâ te quærо proseuchâ;" Jos. *Vit.* 54). These were always near water (cf. Jos. *Antt.* xiv. 10, § 23, "and may make their *proseuchae* at the sea-side, according to the custom of their forefathers"), and we know of no instance of their being on hill-tops.

[3] Robinson writes it Kurûn, which as a plural is good dictionary Arabic. I generally follow Mr. Porter's spelling of modern names in Palestine, as it certainly well represents the actual pronunciation.

and from this plateau the traveller descends through a wild and tropic gorge to the shining levels of the Lake of Galilee. It is the only conspicuous hill on the western side of the lake, and it is singularly adapted by its conformation, both to form a place for short retirement, and a rendezvous for gathering multitudes. Hitherward, in all probability, our Lord wandered in the evening between the rugged and brigand-haunted crags which form the sides of the Vale of Doves, stopping, perhaps, at times to drink the clear water of the little stream, to gather the pleasant apples of the *nubk*, and to watch the eagles swooping down on some near point of rock. And hither, in the morning, less heedful than their Divine Master of the manifold beauties of the scene, the crowd followed Him — loath even for a time to lose His inspiring presence, eager to listen to the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth.

It was at dawn of day, and before the crowd had assembled, that our Lord summoned into His presence the disciples who had gradually gathered around Him. Hitherto the relation which bound them to His person seems to have been loose and partial; and it is doubtful whether they at all realized its full significance. But now the hour was come, and out of the wider band of general followers He made the final and special choice of His twelve Apostles. Their number was insignificant compared to the pompous retinue of hundreds who called themselves followers of a Hillel or a Gamaliel, and their position in life was humble and obscure. Simon and Andrew the sons of Jonas, James and John the sons of Zabdia, and Philip, were of the little village of Bethsaida. If Matthew be the same as Levi, he was a son of Alphæus, and therefore a brother of James the Less and of Jude, the brother of James, who is generally regarded as identical with Lebbæus and Thaddæus. They belonged in all probability to Cana or Capernaum, and if there were any ground for believing the tradition[1] which says that Mary, the wife of Alphæus or Klopas,[2] was a younger sister of the Virgin, then we should have to consider these two brothers as first-cousins of our Lord. Nathanael or Bartholomew was of

[1] The punctuation of John xix. 25 is too uncertain to regard this as undeniable; nor, since James, Judas, Simon are among the very commonest of Jewish names, does this in any way affect the question of the "Brethren of Jesus."

[2] That Alphæus and Klopas may represent חַלְפַּי seems clear; and Kleopas (Luke xxiv. 18) may be only another variation. On the other hand, Kleopas may be a shortened form of Kleopater, as Antipas is of Antipater.

Cana in Galilee.[1] Thomas and Simon Zelotes were also Galilæans. Judas Iscariot was the son of a Simon Iscariot, but whether this Simon is identical with the Zealot cannot be determined.

Of these, "the glorious company of the Apostles," three, James the Less,[2] Jude [the brother[3]] of James, and Simon Zelotes, are almost totally unknown. The very personality of James and Jude is involved in numerous and difficult problems, caused by the extreme frequency of those names among the Jews. Whether they are the authors of the two

[1] This goes against Dr. Donaldson's conjecture that both Philip and Nathanael were sons of Tolmai, and brothers. Dr. Donaldson also argues that Thomas was a twin brother of Matthew, and was originally called Jude; and that Jude was the *son* of James the Less, and therefore *grandson* of Alphæus (see his arguments in *Jashar*, p. 100). (Euseb. *H. E.* i. 13.) — Some legends make Thomas a twin-brother of James.

[2] James should rather be called "the Little" than "the Less." The Greek is ὁ μικρός, which in classical Greek means "the short of stature" (Xen. *Mem.* i. 4, 2; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 250); moreover, James the son of Zebedee is never called the Great.

[3] "Judas of James" *may* mean "*son* of James;" but it is supposed that *both* Judas and the better-known James were sons of Alphæus, as well as Matthew. Judas is almost universally believed (except by Ewald, *Gesch. Christ.*, p. 399) to be the same as Lebbæus and Thaddæus — "the three-named disciple." לב (*lebh*) means "heart;" and Jerome renders the name Corculum. (There is absolutely *no* ground for the notion that he received other names because the name Jehuda has three letters of the Tetragrammaton, and so the Jews avoided it; on the contrary, it was one of the very commonest of Jewish names.) The identification rests partly on the fact that in Matt. x. 3, the reading Λεββαῖος is in ℵ, B, Θαδδαῖος; and in some MSS. Λεββ. ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος. In Mark iii. 18 the reading also varies, but the true reading is probably Θαδδαῖος, who, then, in both lists, occupies the tenth place. In St. Luke's list, the corresponding name, though it occupies the eleventh place, is "Judas of James." The attempt to make Thaddæus *mean* the same as Lebbæus is a mistake, for the Aram. הד (Hebr. שׁד) means *mamma*, not *pectus* or *cor* (Lam. iv. 3, etc.). Ewald identifies Lebbæus with Levi (Mark ii. 14), where Origen (c. *Cels.* ii. 62) seems to have read Λεββής, and conjectures that Thaddæus died early, and "Judas of James" was appointed in his place (*Gesch. Christ.* 399). Clemens of Alexandria certainly distinguishes between Ματθαῖος and Λευΐς (*Strom.* iv. 9, § 73). But the whole subject is involved in almost incredible obscurity. The lists of the Apostles as given by the three Evangelists and in the Acts are as follow: —

Matt. x. 2-4.	Mark iii. 16-19.	Luke vi. 14-16.	Acts i. 13.
1. Simon.	Simon.	Simon.	Peter.
2. Andrew.	James.	Andrew.	James.
3. James.	John.	James.	John.
4. John.	Andrew.	John.	Andrew.
5. Philip.	Philip.	Philip.	Philip.
6. Bartholomew.	Bartholomew.	Bartholomew.	Thomas.
7. Thomas.	Matthew.	Matthew.	Bartholomew.
8. Matthew.	Thomas.	Thomas.	Matthew.
9. James of Alphæus.	James of Alphæus.	James of Alphæus.	James of Alphæus
10. Lebbæus.	Thaddæus.	Simon Zelotes.	Simon Zelotes.
11. Simon ὁ Καναναῖος.	Simon ὁ Καναναῖος.	Jude of James.	Jude of James.
12. Judas Iscariot.	Judas Iscariot.	Judas Iscariot.	

Catholic Epistles, is a question which, perhaps, will never be determined. Nor is anything of individual interest recorded about them in the Gospels, if we except the single question of "Judas, not Iscariot," which is mentioned by St. John.[1] Simon is only known by his surnames of Zelotes, "the Zealot," or "the Canaanite" — names which are identical in meaning, and which mark him out as having once belonged to the wild and furious followers of Judas of Giscala.[2] The Greek names of Philip and Andrew, together with the fact that it was to Philip that the Greeks applied who wished for an interview with our Lord, and his reference of the request to Andrew, may possibly point[3] to some connection on their part with the Hellenists; but, besides their first call, almost nothing is recorded about them; and the same remark applies to Nathanael and to Matthew. Of Thomas, called also Didymus, or "the Twin," which is only a Greek version of his Hebrew name, we catch several interesting glimpses, which show a well-marked character, naïve and simple, but at the same time ardent and generous; ready to die, yet slow to believe. Of Judas, the man of Kerioth,[4] perhaps the only Jew in the Apostolic band, we shall have

[1] John xiv. 22.

[2] קַנָּאָה means "zeal." The true reading of Matt. x. 4; Mark iii. 18 is Καναναῖος, and the form of the word indicates the member of a sect (Lightfoot, *Revision*, p. 138). Ζηλωταὶ παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις οἱ τοῦ νόμου φύλακες (Suid. s. v.). Nicephorus (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 40) says that he derived the name διὰ τὸν πρὸς τὸν διδάσκαλον διάπυρον ζῆλον. For a description of this faction, and their doings, see Jos. *Bell. Jud.* iv. *passim*. "Zealots," he says (iv. 3, § 9), "for that was the name they went by, as if they were zealous in good deeds, and not rather zealous in the worst." They took Phinehas as their type (Numb. xxv. 11-13). Canaanite can hardly mean "of Cana," for that would be Κανθαῖος (Ewald, *Gesch. Christ.*, p. 399). Bruce happily remarks that the choice of an ex-Zealot as an apostle, giving grounds for political suspicion, is another sign of Christ's disregard of mere prudential wisdom. Christ wished the Apostles to be the type and germ of the Church; and therefore we find in it a union of opposites — the tax-gatherer Matthew, and the tax-hater Simon — the unpatriotic Jew who served the alien, and the patriot who strove for emancipation (*Training of the Twelve*, p. 36).

[3] But see *supra*, Chap. X., p. 126.

[4] In John vi. 71, some MSS. read, ἀπὸ Καρυώτου (א, al.). In D this is the reading also of xii. 4; xiii. 2, etc., and Tischendorf thinks that St. John may have always used this form. Kerioth is the name of a town on the southern border of Judah (Josh. xv. 25). Ἰσκαριώτης then means "man (אִישׁ *ish*) of Kerioth," just as Ἰσταβός, "a man of Tob" (Jos. *Antt.* vii. 6, § 1). Ewald, however (*Gesch. Christ.*, p. 398), identifies it with *Kartah* in Zebulun (Josh. xxi. 34). Other derivations of the name (*e.g.*, *scortea*, "a leather apron," *askara*, "suffocation," etc.; see Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, in Matt. x. 4) are hardly worth noticing; but it must be admitted that the reading in Josh. xv. 25 is dubious, being probably Kerioth-Hezron, *i.e.*, "cities of Hezron, which is Hazor." Robinson identifies the place with *Kuryetein*, "the two cities" — a ruined site, ten miles south of Hebron.

sad occasion to speak hereafter; and throughout the Gospels he is often branded by the fatal epitaph, so terrible in its very simplicity, "Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed Him."[1]

James, John, and Peter belonged to the innermost circle — the ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι — of our Lord's associates and friends.[2] They alone were admitted into His presence when He raised the daughter of Jairus, and at His transfiguration, and during His agony in the garden. Of James we know nothing further except that to him was granted the high honor of being the first martyr in the Apostolic band. He and his brother John seem, although they were fishermen, to have been in easier circumstances than their associates. Zebedee, their father, not only had his own boat, but also his own hired servants; and John mentions incidentally in his Gospel that he "was known to the high priest."[3] We have already noticed the not improbable conjecture that he resided much at Jerusalem, and there managed the importing of the fish which were sent thither from the Sea of Galilee. We should thus be able to account for his more intimate knowledge of those many incidents of our Lord's ministry in Judæa which have been entirely omitted by the other Evangelists.

[1] Matt. x. 4. The ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης, "who became a traitor," of Luke vi. 16, is a little less severe. If Simon the Zealot bore also the name Iscariot, as would appear from ℵ, B, C, G, L, etc., in John vi. 71; xiii. 26, then he was a father of the traitor. If he were, as some traditions say, a son of "Clopas, or Alphæus," it might appear that nearly all the apostles were related to each other and to our Lord. If we accept the suggestions of different writers on the subject, James and John, James the Less, Jude, Matthew, and Simon were all His first-cousins, and Judas Iscariot His second-cousin. The notion that Thomas was a twin-brother, according to some of Matthew, according to others of Thaddæus, according to others of Jesus Himself, merely arises from his name. But all these suppositions depend on dubious conjecture of wavering tradition, and it is hardly needful to recount all the various guesses and attempted combinations of modern writers. It is, however, an interesting fact that so many of the Apostles were brothers — two sons of Zabdia, two of Jonas, three (at least), if not four, of Alphæus, besides (possibly) two sons of Tolmai, and a father and son.

[2] I have already mentioned the conjecture derived from John xix. 25, that Salome was a sister of the Virgin (*v. supr.*, p. 121, *n.* 2). But if the sons of Zebedee were the first-cousins of Jesus, it would be strange that no hint or tradition of the fact should have been preserved. Zebedee probably died shortly after their final call to the Apostolate, as we hear no more of him.

[3] The story of his wearing a πέταλον (Exod. xxviii. 36; xxix. 6) at Ephesus, as though he had himself been of priestly race (ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκώς, Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31) sounds very apocryphal. Yet it is strange that such a story should have been invented, especially as we find the same thing asserted of James the Just, "the Lord's brother" (Epiphan. *Haer.* xxix. 4; Ewald, *Gesch. Christus*, p. 246, 3d ed.). Perhaps in this instance, as in others, a symbolic allusion has been too literally interpreted as a fact.

St. John and St. Peter — the one the symbol of the contemplative, the other of the practical life — are undoubtedly the grandest and most attractive figures in that Apostolic band. The character of St. John has been often mistaken. Filled as he was with a most divine tenderness — realizing as he did to a greater extent than any of the Apostles the full depth and significance of our Lord's new commandment — rich as his Epistles and his Gospel are with a meditative and absorbing reverence — dear as he has ever been in consequence to the heart of the mystic and the saint — yet he was something indefinitely far removed from that effeminate pietist which has furnished the usual type under which he has been represented. The name Boanerges, or "Sons of Thunder," which he shared with his brother James,[1] their joint petition for precedence in the kingdom of God, their passionate request to call down fire from heaven on the offending village of the Samaritans,[2] the burning energy of the *patois* in which the Apocalypse is written, the impetuous horror with which, according to tradition, St. John recoiled from the presence of the heretic Cerinthus,[3] all show that in him was the spirit of the eagle, which, rather than the dove, has been his immemorial symbol.[4] And since zeal and enthusiasm, dead as they are, and scorned in these days by an effete and comfortable religionism, yet have ever been indispensable instruments in spreading the Kingdom of Heaven, doubtless it was the existence of these elements in his character, side by side with tenderness and devotion, which endeared him so greatly to his Master, and made him the "disciple whom Jesus loved." The wonderful depth and power of his imagination, the rare combination of contemplativeness and passion, of strength and sweetness, in the same soul — the perfect faith which inspired his devotion, and the perfect love which precluded fear — these were the gifts and graces which rendered him worthy of leaning his young head on the bosom of his Lord.

Nor is his friend St. Peter a less interesting study. We shall have many opportunities of observing the generous, impetuous, wavering, noble, timid impulses of his thoroughly human but most lovable disposition. Let the brief but vivid summary of another now suffice. "It would be hard

[1] *Bene R'aasch* (Grätz, *Gesch. d. Jud.* iii. 231).
[2] Luke ix. 54.
[3] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 14. The heretic is also said to have been Ebion (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 24).
[4] The same spirit appears in Luke ix. 49; Rev. xxii. 18; 2 John 9, 10.

to tell," says Dr. Hamilton, "whether most of his fervor flowed through the outlet of adoration or activity. His full heart put force and promptitude into every movement. Is his Master encompassed by fierce ruffians? — Peter's ardor flashes in his ready sword, and converts the Galilæan boatman into the soldier instantaneous. Is there a rumor of a resurrection from Joseph's tomb? — John's nimbler foot distances his older friend; but Peter's eagerness outruns the serene love of John, and past the gazing disciple he rushes breathless into the vacant sepulchre. Is the risen Saviour on the strand? — his comrades secure the net, and turn the vessel's head for shore; but Peter plunges over the vessel's side, and struggling through the waves, in his dripping coat falls down at his Master's feet. Does Jesus say, 'Bring of the fish ye have caught'? — ere any one could anticipate the word, Peter's brawny arm is lugging the weltering net with its glittering spoil ashore, and every eager movement unwittingly is answering beforehand the question of his Lord, 'Simon, lovest thou me?' And that fervor is the best, which, like Peter's, and as occasion requires, can ascend in ecstatic ascriptions of adoration and praise, or follow Christ to prison and to death; which can concentrate itself on feats of heroic devotion, or distribute itself in the affectionate assiduities of a miscellaneous industry."[1]

Such were the chief of the Apostles whom their Lord united into one band as He sat on the green summit of Kurn Hattîn. We may suppose that on one of those two peaks He had passed the night in prayer, and had there been joined by His disciples at the early dawn. By what external symbol, if by any, our Lord ratified this first great ordination to the Apostolate we do not know; but undoubtedly the present choice was regarded as formal and as final. Henceforth there was to be no return to the fisher's boat or the publican's booth as a source of sustenance; but the disciples were to share the wandering missions, the evangelic labors, the scant meal and uncertain home, which marked even the happiest period of the ministry of their Lord. They were to be weary with Him under the burning noonday, and to sleep, as he did, under the starry sky.

And while the choice was being made, a vast promiscuous multitude had begun to gather. Not only from the densely populated shores of the Sea of Galilee, but even from Judæa

[1] Dr. Hamilton, *Life in Earnest*, p. 80.

and Jerusalem — nay, even from the distant sea-coasts of Tyre and Sidon — they had crowded to touch His person and hear His words.[1] From the peak He descended to the flat summit of the hill,[2] and first of all occupied Himself with the physical wants of those anxious hearers, healing their diseases, and dispossessing the unclean spirits of the souls which they had seized. And then, when the multitude were seated in calm and serious attention on the grassy sides of that lovely natural amphitheatre, He raised His eyes,[3] which had, perhaps, been bent downwards for a few moments of inward prayer, and opening His mouth,[4] delivered primarily to His disciples, but intending through them to address the multitude, that memorable discourse which will be known for ever as "the Sermon on the Mount."

The most careless reader has probably been struck with the contrast between the delivery of this sermon and the delivery of the Law on Sinai. We think of that as a "fiery law," whose promulgation is surrounded by the imagery of thunders, and lightnings, and the voice of the trumpet sounding long and waxing louder and louder. We think of this as flowing forth in divinest music amid all the calm and loveliness of the clear and quiet dawn. That came dreadfully to the startled conscience from an Unseen Presence, shrouded by wreathing clouds, and destroying fire, and eddying smoke; this was uttered by a sweet human voice that moved the heart most gently in words of peace. That was delivered on the desolate and storm-rent hill which seems with its red granite crags to threaten the scorching wilderness; this on the flowery grass of the green hill-side which slopes down to the silver lake. That shook the heart with terror and agitation; this soothed it with peace and love. And yet the New Commandments of the Mount of Beati-

[1] Luke vi. 17-19. Assuming, with little or no hesitation, that St. Luke intends to record the same great discourse as that given by St. Matthew, I have here, as in so many other places, combined the separate touches in the twofold narrative. The apparent differences are easily accounted for by any reasonable theory of the position of the Evangelists. At the same time I see no objection whatever to the supposition that our Lord may have repeated parts of His teaching at different times and places, and to different audiences; or that St. Matthew has combined and summarized not one but many sermons delivered on the Galilæan hills.

[2] The τόπος πεδινὸς of Luke vi. 17, which is too briefly rendered "the plain" in the English Version. Cf. Isa. xiii. 2, ἐπ' ὄρους πεδινοῦ ἄρατε σημεῖον, LXX.

[3] Luke vi. 20.

[4] Matt. v. 2. The expression marks the solemnity and importance of the discourse.

tudes were not meant to abrogate, but rather to complete, the Law which was spoken from Sinai to them of old.[1] The Law was founded on the eternal distinctions of right and wrong — distinctions strong and irremovable as the granite bases of the world. Easier would it be to sweep away the heaven and the earth, than to destroy the least letter, one *yod* — or the least point of a letter, one projecting horn — of that code which contains the very principles of all moral life. Jesus warned them that He came, not to abolish that Law, but to obey and to fulfil; while at the same time He taught that this obedience had nothing to do with the Levitical scrupulosity of a superstitious adherence to the letter, but was rather a surrender of the heart and will to the innermost meaning and spirit which the commands involved. He fulfilled that olden Law by perfectly keeping it, and by imparting a power to keep it to all who believe in him, even though He made its cogency so far more universal and profound.[2]

The sermon began with the word "blessed," and with an octave of beatitudes. But it was a *new* revelation of beatitude. The people were expecting a Messiah who should break the yoke off their necks — a king clothed in earthly splendor, and manifested in the pomp of victory and vengeance. Their minds were haunted with legendary prophecies as to how He should stand on the shore of Joppa, and bid the sea pour out its pearls and treasures at His feet; how He should clothe them with jewels and scarlet, and feed them with even a sweeter manna than the wilderness had known. But Christ reveals to them another King, another happiness — the riches of poverty, the royalty of meekness, the high beatitude of sorrow and persecution. And this new Law, which should not only command but also aid, was to be set forth in beneficent manifestation — at once as salt to preserve the world from corruption, and as a light to guide it in the darkness. And then follows a comparison of the new Law of mercy with the old Law of threatening; the old was transitory, this permanent; the old was a type and shadow, the new a fulfilment and completion; the old demanded obedience in outward action, the new was to per-

[1] Τοῖς ἀρχαίοις (Matt. v. 21). Not "by," as in our A. V., but "to" them of old; "to eld men" (Wiclif). The Rabbis, too, spoke of the abiding permanence of the Law, but they applied the remark materially, not, as Jesus does, spiritually.

[2] See the beautiful remarks of St. Augustine, quoted in Archbishop Trench's *Sermon on the Mount*, p. 186.

meate the thoughts; the old contained the rule of conduct, the new the secret of obedience. The command, "Thou shalt not murder," was henceforth extended to angry words and feelings of hatred.[1] The germ of adultery was shown to be involved in a lascivious look. The prohibition of perjury was extended to every vain and unnecessary oath. The law of equivalent revenge was superseded by a law of absolute self-abnegation. The love due to our neighbor was extended also to our enemy.[2] Henceforth the children of the kingdom were to aim at nothing less than this — namely, to be *perfect*, as their Father in heaven is perfect.

And the new life which was to issue from this new Law was to be contrasted in all respects with that routine of exaggerated scruples and Pharisaic formalism which had hitherto been regarded as the highest type of a religious conversation. Alms were to be given, not with noisy ostentation, but in modest secrecy.[3] Prayers were to be uttered, not

[1] The word εἰκῇ (D, many uncials, the Vetus Itala, the Cureton Syriac, etc.) in Matt. v. 22, whether genuine or not, expresses the true sense, for there is such a thing as a righteous anger, and a justifiable indignation (Eph. iv. 26). Augustine finely and truly says, "Non fratri irascitur, qui peccato fratris irascitur" (*Retract.* i. 19). The word μωρέ in the same verse may be not merely "fool," but "rebel," "apostate;" the Hebrew *morah* (Numb. xx. 10). (Of course, I do not mean that μωρὸς is *derived from*, but merely that it was *suggested by* the Hebrew word, as is the case very often in LXX. renderings.) But the thing which Jesus forbids is not the mere use of particular expressions — for if that were all, He might have instanced taunts and libels ten thousand times more deadly — but the spirit of rage and passion out of which such expressions spring. Thus *Raca* (ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ) is used, with due cause, by St. James (ii. 20), and μωρὸς is applied to the blind and wicked, not only by David (Ps. xiv. 1), but by our Lord Himself (Matt. xxiii. 17).

[2] Matt. v. 43, "And hate thine enemy," has been severely criticised by later Jews as a misrepresentation of the Mosaic Law. See, however, Deut. xxiii. 6; vii. 2. And although these precepts were of special significance, certainly many of the Rabbis, including Shammai himself, had made use of the Mosaic Law to justify the most violent national and religious hatred (*v.* Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr., ad loc.*). He quotes, among other passages from the Talmud, *Midr. Tehillin*, f. 26, 4: "Do not show kindness or pity to Gentiles." Lightfoot, *ib.*, quotes one from Maimonides, and says, "Exemplum hoc unum satis sit pro plurimis, quae praesto sunt ubique." "The Mishna," says Gfrörer (*Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 114), "is full of such passages," and if the Jews had not acted in the spirit of them, we should not have had the charges against them in Tacitus ("adversus omnes alios hostile odium," *H.* v. 5) and Juvenal ("Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti," *Sat.* xiv. 103).

[3] There is no trace in the Talmud or elsewhere that it was a practice of the Pharisees to send a trumpeter before them when they distributed their alms (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. in Matt.* vi. 2). The expression "do not sound a trumpet before thee" is merely a graphic touch for "do not do it publicly and ostentatiously" (cf. Numb. x. 3; Ps. lxxxi. 3; Joel ii. 15, etc.). Mr. Shore, in the *Bible Educator*, approves of Schöttgen's conjecture, which connects it with the trumpet-shaped openings of the alms-boxes in

with hypocritic publicity, but in holy solitude. Fasting was to be exercised, not as a belauded virtue, but as a private self-denial. And all these acts of devotion were to be offered with sole reference to the love of God, in a simplicity which sought no earthly reward, but which stored up for itself a heavenly and incorruptible treasure. And the service to be sincere must be entire and undistracted. The cares and the anxieties of life were not to divert its earnestness or to trouble its repose. The God to whom it was directed was a Father also, and He who ever feeds the fowls of the air, which neither sow nor reap, and clothes in their more than regal loveliness the flowers of the field,[1] would not fail to clothe and feed, and that without any need for their own toilsome anxiety, the children who seek His righteousness as their first desire.

And what should be the basis of such service? The self-examination which issues in a gentleness which will not condemn, in a charity that cannot believe, in an ignorance that will not know, the sins of others; the reserve which will not waste or degrade things holy; the faith which seeks for strength from above, and knows that, seeking rightly, it shall obtain; the self-denial which, in the desire to increase God's glory and man's happiness, sees the sole guide of its actions towards all the world.

The gate was strait, the path narrow, but it led to life; by the lives and actions of those who professed to live by it, and point it out, they were to judge whether their doctrine was true or false; without this neither words of orthodoxy would avail, nor works of power.

Lastly, He warned them that he who heard these sayings and did them was like a wise man who built a house with foundations dug deeply into the living rock, whose house, because it was founded upon a rock, stood unshaken amid the vehement beating of storm and surge: but he who heard and did them not was likened "unto a foolish man that built

the Temple treasury (Neh. xii. 41); but surely "do not trumpet" could never mean "do not make your shekels rattle in those trumpet-shaped orifices." It is true that they were called *shopherôth* (Reland, *De Spol. Templ. Hierosol.* xii.) Grotius connects the expression with Amos iv. 5; and Rashi with a supposed custom (Targ. Hos. xiv. 8) of blowing the trumpet during libations in the Temple.

[1] Compare the name *Kaiserkrone* for the imperial martagon. The lilies to which Christ alluded (Matt. vi. 28) are either flowers generally, or, perhaps, the scarlet anemone, or the Huleh lily — a beautiful flower which is found wild in this neighborhood. In verse 27, ἡλικία should be rendered "age," not "stature," as in John ix. 21; Eph. iv. 13; Heb. xi. 11. Cf. δάκτυλος ἀμέρα, Alc., and Ps. xxxix. 5.

his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house: and it fell, and great was the fall of it."[1]

Such in barest and most colorless outline are the topics of that mighty sermon; nor is it marvellous that they who heard it "were astonished at the doctrine." Their main astonishment was that He taught "as one having authority, and not as the Scribes."[2] The teaching of their Scribes was

[1] With this simile compare Ezek. xiii. 11; Job xxvii. 18. Schöttgen quotes an analogous comparison from the *Pirke Abhôth* iii. 17, and *Abhôth de Rabbi Nathan*, c. 23 (a late Jewish writer). For an admirable sketch of the topics handled in the Sermon on the Mount, see Westcott's *Introd.*, p. 358. In outline he arranges it thus: — 1. "The Citizens of the Kingdom (v. 1–16) — their character absolutely (3–6); relatively (7–12); and their influence (13–16). 2. The New Law (17–48) as the fulfilment of the Old, generally (17–20) and specially (murder, adultery, perjury, revenge, exclusiveness, 21–48). 3. The New Life (vi.–vii. 27); acts of devotion (vi. 1–18), aims (19–34), conduct (vii. 1–12), dangers (vii. 13–23). 4. The Great Contrast." Many Rabbinical parables — always inferior in beauty, in point, in breadth, and in spirituality — have been compared with separate clauses of the Sermon on the Mount. Since even the Mishna was not committed to writing till the second century, and since it is therefore impossible to estimate the diffusion of Christian thought even among hostile Rabbinic writers, nothing conclusive can be assured from these parallels. It is a great mistake, as a friend observes, to suppose that the world is made in water-tight compartments, even when the divisions seem most absolute. In fact, hostility may be less a barrier than a channel, at least when accompanied by competition. Protestantism has reacted upon Romanism, but nothing like to the extent that Christianity reacted upon Judaism. But even if we suppose the Rabbinic parallels, such as they are, to be independent and precedent, yet, considering the fact that high moral truths have been uttered even by pagans, from the earliest times — and considering that all discovery of moral truths is due to that revealing Spirit which is called in Scripture "the candle of the Lord" (Prov. xx. 27) — the question of "originality," to which some writers attach so much importance, seems to be futile, and devoid of all significance. I have not thought it worth while to adduce these parallels, except in rare and interesting cases. The attack on the score of its not being "original" is the one of all others from which Christianity has least to fear. The question of mere literary precedence in the utterance or illustration of a moral truth is one which has no importance for mankind. A truth so enunciated that it merely lies "in the lumber-room of the memory, side by side with the most exploded errors," is practically no truth at all; it only becomes real when it is so taught as to become potent among human motives.

> "Though truths in manhood darkly join,
> Deep-seated in our mystic frame,
> We yield all honor to the name
> Of Him who made them current coin."

[2] The Scribes (*Sopherîm*) date as a distinct body from the period of Ezra. The name is derived from *sepher*, "or book," and means "Scripturalists" — those who explained and copied the Law; not from *saphar*, "to count," because they *counted* all the letters of it (Derenbourg, *Hist. Pal.* 25). Their functions were to copy, read, amend, explain, and protect the Law. It was in the latter capacity that they invented the "fences," which, under the title of *Dibherî Sopherîm*, "words of the Scribes," formed

narrow, dogmatic, material; it was cold in manner, frivolous in matter, second-hand, and iterative in its very essence; with no freshness in it, no force, no fire; servile to all authority, opposed to all independence; at once erudite and foolish, at once contemptuous and mean; never passing a hair's breadth beyond the carefully watched boundary line of commentary and precedent; full of balanced inference and orthodox hesitancy, and impossible literalism; intricate with legal pettiness and labyrinthine system; elevating mere memory above genius, and repetition above originality; concerned only about Priests and Pharisees, in Temple and synagogue, or school, or Sanhedrin, and mostly occupied with things infinitely little. It was not indeed wholly devoid of moral significance, nor is it impossible to find here and there, among the *débris* of it, a noble thought; but it was occupied a thousandfold more with Levitical minutiæ about mint, and anise, and cummin, and the length of fringes, and the breadth of phylacteries, and the washing of cups and platters, and the particular quarter of a second when new moons and Sabbath-days began.[1] But this teach-

the nucleus of the "tradition of the elders" (Matt. xv. 2; Gal. i. 14), or Oral Law (the *Torah shebeal pi*, or "Law upon the lip," as distinguished from the *Torah shebeketeb*, or "Law which is in writing"), any transgression of which is declared by the Mishna to be more heinous than a transgression of the words of the Bible (*Sanhedrin*, x. 3). The *Sopherim* proper only lasted from Ezra to the death of Simon the Just, B.C. 300, and they were succeeded by the *Tanaim*, or teachers of the Law — the νομικοὶ and νομοδιδάσκαλοι of the Gospels, who lasted to A.D. 220, and fixed the "Words of the Scribes" into "Halachóth," or "rules of action," chiefly intended to form a *seyag latôrah*, or "hedge about the Law." The *Tanaim* inherited a splendor of reputation which was reflected on them from their predecessors, who held a most exalted position (Ecclus. xxxix. 1-11). But the name γραμματεὺς still continued to exist, although in a less lofty meaning than it had previously acquired. Secondhandness, the slavish dependence on precedent and authority, is the most remarkable characteristic of Rabbinical teaching. It very rarely rises above the level of a commentary at once timid and fantastic. R. Eliezer actually made it his boast that he had originated nothing; and Hillel's grand position, as *Nasi*, or President of the Sanhedrin, was simply due to his having remembered a decision of Shemaia and Abtalion. "Get for thyself a teacher," was a characteristic gnome of Joshua Ben Perachia, whom the Talmud calls "the Teacher of Christ."

[1] Any one who chooses to take the trouble, may verify these assertions for himself. Much has been written lately in exaltation of the Talmud. Now the literature to which the general name of Talmud is given, occupies twelve immense folio volumes; and it would be strange indeed if out of this vast encyclopædia of a nation's literature, it were not possible to quote a few eloquent passages, some beautiful illustrations, and a considerable number of just moral sentiments which sometimes rise to the dignity of noble thoughts. But what seems to me absolutely indisputable, and what any one may judge of for himself, is that all that is really valuable in the Talmud is infinitesimally small compared with the almost immeas-

ing of Jesus was wholly different in its character, and as much grander as the temple of the morning sky under which it was uttered was grander than stifling synagogue or crowded school. It was preached, as each occasion rose, on the hill-side, or by the lake, or on the roads, or in the house of the Pharisee, or at the banquet of the Publican; nor was it any sweeter or loftier when it was addressed in the Royal Portico to the Masters of Israel, than when its only hearers were the ignorant people whom the haughty Pharisees held to be accursed. And there was no reserve in its administration. It flowed forth as sweetly and as lavishly to single listeners as to enraptured crowds; and some of its very richest revelations were vouchsafed, neither to rulers nor to multitudes, but to the persecuted outcast of the Jewish synagogue, to the timid inquirer in the lonely midnight, and the frail woman by the noonday well. And it dealt, not with scrupulous tithes and ceremonial cleansings, but with the human soul, and human destiny, and human life — with Hope, and Charity, and Faith. There were no definitions in it, or explanations, or "scholastic systems," or philosophic theorizing, or implicated mazes of difficult and dubious discussion, but a swift intuitive insight into the very depths of

urable rubbish-heaps in which it is imbedded. Let any one, for instance, take in hand the recent French translation of one of the most important Talmudic treatises. The Talmud — *i.e.*, the Mishna and Gemara — is divided into six *Sedarîm*, or "orders," the first of which is called *Seder Zeraîm*, or "Order of Seeds," and the first treatise of this is called *Berachôth*, or "Blessings," and is composed of nine chapters on "the confession, worship, and service of the one God, and of prayers and benedictions offered to Him as the Giver of the blessings of Life. This has been translated into French by a learned Hebraist, M. Moïse Schwab, of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The subject of this treatise is infinitely more elevating and important than that of any other of the sixty-three *massiktoth*, or "treatises" of which the Mishna is composed. Now I will ask any reader or critic who considers that I have spoken too slightingly of the Scribes in the above passage, or have unduly depreciated the Talmud in other parts of this book, merely to take at haphazard any three *perakîm*, or chapters of the *Berachôth*, and make an abstract of them. I shall be indeed surprised if after accepting this little test he still retains the exalted conception of these Jewish writings which some recent writers — notably the late lamented Mr. Deutsch — have endeavored to create. Few English divines have known the Talmud so thoroughly as Dr. Lightfoot, the learned author of the *Horae Hebraicae* (d. 1675). He was a man of eminent candor and simplicity, and his estimate of the Talmud, after an almost lifelong study of it, was as follows: "Volumina ista legentem supra modum cruciant, torquent, et fatigant, styli difficultas tantum non insuperabilis, linguae asperitas tremenda, et rerum tractatarum STUPENDA INANITAS ET VAFRITIES. Nugis ubique scatent ita ac si nollent legi; obscuris ac difficilibus ac si nollent intelligi; ita ut ubique patientiâ Lectori sit opus, et nugas ferendo et asperitates." (*Dedic. in Hor. Hebr. in Matth.*, 1658.) — See Excursus V., "The Talmud and the Oral Law."

the human heart — even a supreme and daring paradox that, without being fenced round with exceptions or limitations, appealed to the conscience with its irresistible simplicity, and with an absolute mastery stirred and dominated over the heart. Springing from the depths of holy emotions, it thrilled the being of every listener as with an electric flame. In a word, its authority was the authority of the Divine Incarnate; it was a voice of God, speaking in the utterance of man; its austere purity was yet pervaded with tenderest sympathy, and its awful severity with an unutterable love. It is, to borrow the image of the wisest of the Latin Fathers, a great sea whose smiling surface breaks into refreshing ripples at the feet of our little ones, but into whose unfathomable depths the wisest may gaze with the shudder of amazement and the thrill of love.[1]

And we, who can compare Christ's teaching — the teaching of One whom some would represent to have been no more than the Carpenter of Nazareth — with all that the world has of best and greatest in Philosophy and Eloquence and Song, must not we too add, with yet deeper emphasis, that teaching as one having authority, He spake as never man spake? Other teachers have by God's grace uttered words of wisdom, but to which of them has it been granted to regenerate mankind? What would the world be now if it had nothing better than the dry aphorisms and cautious hesitations of Confucius, or the dubious principles and dangerous concessions of Plato? Would humanity have made the vast moral advance which it *has* made, if no great Prophet from on high had furnished it with anything better than Sakya Mouni's dreary hope of a *nirvâna*, to be won by unnatural asceticism, or than Mahomet's cynical sanction of polygamy and despotism? Christianity may have degenerated in many respects from its old and great ideal; it may have lost something of its virgin purity — the struggling and divided Church of to-day may have waned, during these long centuries, from the splendor of the New Jerusalem descending out of heaven from God: but is Christendom no

[1] "Mira profunditas eloquiorum tuorum, quorum ecce ante nos superficies blandiens parvulis: sed mira profunditas, Deus meus, mira profunditas! Horror est intendere in eam; horror honoris et tremor amoris" (Augustine, *Conf.* xii. 14). On the general characteristics of Christian teaching there are some very beautiful and interesting remarks in Guizot, *Méditations sur l'Essence de la Religion Chrétienne*, p. 279; Dupanloup, *Vie de Notre Seigneur*, pp. lxxiv. seqq. To avoid repetition, I may refer on this subject to the third of my Hulsean Lectures on the *Witness of History to Christ*, pp. 134–149.

better than what Greece became, and what Turkey and Arabia and China are? Does Christianity wither the nations which have accepted it with the atrophy of Buddhism, or the blight of Islam? [1] Even as a moral system — though it is infinitely more than a moral system — we do not concede that Christianity is unoriginal; and we besides maintain that no faith has ever been able like it to sway the affections and hearts of men. Other religions are demonstrably defective and erroneous; ours has never been proved to be otherwise than perfect and entire; other systems were esoteric and exclusive, ours simple and universal; others temporary and for the few, ours eternal and for the race. K'ung Foo-tze, Sakya Mouni, Mahomet, could not even conceive the ideal of a society without falling into miserable error; Christ established the reality of an eternal and glorious kingdom — whose theory for all, whose history in the world, prove it to be indeed what it was from the first proclaimed to be — the Kingdom of Heaven, the Kingdom of God.[2]

And yet how exquisitely and freshly simple is the actual language of Christ compared with all other teaching that has ever gained the ear of the world! There is no science in it, no art, no pomp of demonstration, no carefulness of toil, no trick of rhetoricians, no wisdom of the schools. Straight as an arrow to the mark His precepts pierce to the very depths of the soul and spirit. All is short, clear, precise, full of holiness, full of the common images of daily life. There is scarcely a scene or object familiar to the Galilee of that day, which Jesus did not use as a moral illustration of some glorious promise or moral law. He spoke of green fields, and springing flowers, and the budding of the vernal trees; of the red or lowering sky; of sunrise and sunset; of wind and rain; of night and storm; of clouds and lightning; of stream and river; of stars and lamps; of honey and salt; of quivering bulrushes and burning weeds; of rent garments and bursting wine-skins; of eggs and ser-

[1] A blight certainly in Turkey, Arabia, and Egypt, and surely everywhere non-progressive; but Islam being, as it is, a professed modification of Judaism and Christianity, can hardly be counted an independent religion, and is indeed a degeneracy even from Judaism. On Mahomet's teaching in general see some wise remarks in Prof. Mozley's Bampton Lectures *On Miracles*, p. 179. The reader may form some conception of K'ung Foo-tze from Dr. Legge's *Life and Teaching of Confucius*, which contains a translation of the Analects; and of Sakya Mouni from M. B. St. Hilaire's *Le Bouddha et sa Religion* (Paris, 1860).

[2] See further *The Witness of History to Christ*, pp. 142, seqq.

pents; of pearls and pieces of money; of nets and fish. Wine and wheat, corn and oil, stewards and gardeners, laborers and employers, kings and shepherds, travellers and fathers of families, courtiers in soft clothing and brides in nuptial robes — all these are found in His discourses. He knew all life, and gazed on it with a kindly as well as a kingly glance. He could sympathize with its joys no less than He could heal its sorrows, and the eyes that were so often suffused with tears as they saw the sufferings of earth's mourners beside the bed of death, had shone also with a kindlier glow as they watched the games of earth's happy little ones in the green fields and busy streets.[1]

[1] Few have spoken more beautifully of our Lord's teaching in these respects than Bishop Dupanloup, *Vie de Notre Seigneur*, *l. c.*, in whom the main thought of the last paragraph will be found at much greater length. Much that I have said in this chapter is beautifully illustrated in a little poem by Arthur Hugh Clough, part of which (if it be not known to him) the reader will thank me for quoting: —

"'Across the sea, along the shore,
In numbers ever more and more,
From lonely hut and busy town,
The valley through, the mountain down,
What was it ye went out to see,
Ye silly folk of Galilee?
The reed that in the wind doth shake?
The weed that washes in the lake?
. . . . . .
'A teacher? Rather seek the feet
Of those who sit in Moses' seat.
Go, humbly seek, and bow to them
Far off in great Jerusalem. . . .
What is it came ye here to note?
A young man preaching in a boat.

'A Prophet! Boys and women weak!
Declare — and cease to rave —
Whence is it He hath learnt to speak?
Say, who His doctrine gave?
A Prophet? Prophet wherefore He
Of all in Israel's tribes?'—
He teacheth with authority
And not as do the Scribes."

CHAPTER XIX.

FURTHER MIRACLES.

"He sent forth His word, and healed them." — Ps. cvii. 20.

The Inauguration of the Great Doctrine was immediately followed and ratified by mighty signs. Jesus went, says one of the Fathers, from teaching to miracle.[1] Having taught as one who had authority, He proceeded to confirm that authority by accordant deeds.

It might have been thought that after a night of ceaseless prayer under the open sky, followed at early dawn by the choice of Twelve Apostles, and by a long address to them and to a vast promiscuous multitude, our Lord would have retired to the repose which such incessant activity required. Such, however, was very far from being the case, and the next few days, if we rightly grasp the sequence of events, were days of continuous and unwearying toil.

When the Sermon was over, the immense throng dispersed in various directions, and those whose homes lay in the plain of Gennesareth would doubtless follow Jesus through the village of Hattîn, and across the narrow plateau, and then, after descending the ravine, would leave Magdala on the right, and pass through Bethsaida [2] to Capernaum.

As He descended the mountain,[3] and was just entering one of the little towns,[4] probably a short distance in advance of the multitude, who from natural respect would be likely to leave Him undisturbed after His labors, a pitiable spec-

[1] Euthymius. Matt. viii. 1–4; Mark i. 40–45; Luke v. 12–16. — St. Matthew narrates twenty miracles; St. Mark, eighteen; St. Luke, nineteen; and St. John, seven. The total number of miracles related by the Evangelists is thirty-three.

[2] *i.e.*, the *Western* Bethsaida — probably the pleasant spot on the lake with its gently sloping banks, abundant streams, and strip of bright sand, now called Ain et-Tâbijah.

[3] This definite mark of time and place is furnished by St. Matthew (viii. 1). I have combined with his narrative the incidents alluded to by the two other Synoptists.

[4] Luke v. 12. Hattîn, or Magdala, would best suit the conditions mentioned.

tacle met His eyes. Suddenly,[1] with agonies of entreaty, falling first on his knees, then, in the anguish of his heart and the intensity of his supplication, prostrating himself upon his face,[2] there appeared before Him, with bare head, and rent garments, and covered lip, a leper — "full of leprosy" — smitten with the worst and foulest form of that loathsome and terrible disease. It must, indeed, have required on the part of the poor wretch a stupendous faith to believe that the young Prophet of Nazareth was One who could heal a disease of which the worst misery was the belief that, when once thoroughly seated in the blood, it was ineradicable and progressive. And yet the concentrated hope of a life broke out in the man's impassioned prayer, "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean." Prompt as an echo came the answer to his faith, "I will: be thou clean."[3] All Christ's miracles are revelations also. Sometimes, when the circumstances of the case required it, He delayed His answer to a sufferer's prayer. But we are never told that there was a moment's pause when a *leper* cried to him. Leprosy was an acknowledged type of sin, and Christ would teach us that the heartfelt prayer of the sinner to be purged and cleansed is always met by instantaneous acceptance. When David, the type of all true penitents, cried with intense contrition, "I have sinned against the Lord," Nathan could instantly convey to him God's gracious message, "The Lord also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die."[4]

Instantly stretching forth His hand, our Lord touched the leper, and he was cleansed.

It was a glorious violation of the *letter* of the Law, which attached ceremonial pollution to a leper's touch;[5] but it

[1] This is implied in the καὶ ἰδοὺ of Luke v. 12; Matt. viii. 2. The phrase is peculiar to these two Evangelists, of whom St. Matthew uses it twenty-three, and St. Luke sixteen times (Westcott, *Introd.*, p. 237, *n.*).

[2] προσεκύνει (Matt. viii. 2), γονυπετῶν (Mark i. 40), πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (Luke v. 12). A leper was regarded as one dead (Jos. *Antt.* iii. 11, § 3, μηδενὶ συνδιαιτωμένους καὶ νεκροῦ μηδὲν διαφέροντας).

[3] "Echo prompta ad fidem leprosi maturam" (Bengel). St. Ambrose says, very fancifully, "Dicit volo propter Photinum imperat propter Arium; tangit propter Manichæum." The prompt, almost impetuous gladness and spontaneity of these miracles contrasts with the sorrow and delay of those later ones, which Jesus wrought when His heart had been utterly saddened, and men's faith in Him had already begun to wane (cf. Matt. xiii. 58; Mark vi. 5). "Prima miracula fecit confestim ne videretur cum labore facere" (Bengel).

[4] 2 Sam. xii. 13.

[5] Lev. xiii. 26, 46; Numb. v. 2. — "Quia Dominus Legis est non obsequitur Legi, sed Legem facit" (Ambr., *in Luc.*).

was at the same time a glorious illustration of the *spirit* of the Law, which was that mercy is better than sacrifice. The hand of Jesus was not polluted by touching the leper's body, but the leper's whole body was cleansed by the touch of that holy hand. It was even thus that He touched our sinful human nature, and yet remained without spot of sin.[1]

It was in the depth and spontaneity of His human emotion that our Lord had touched the leper into health. But it was His present desire to fulfil the Mosaic Law by perfect obedience; and both in proof of the miracle, and out of consideration to the sufferer, and in conformity with the Levitical ordinance, He bade the leper go and show himself to the priest, make the customary offerings, and obtain the legal certificate that he was clean.[2] He accompanied the direction with a strict and even stern injunction to say not one word of it to any one.[3] It appears from this that the suddenness with which the miracle had been accomplished had kept it secret from all, except perhaps a few of our Lord's immediate followers, although it had been wrought in open day, and in the immediate neighborhood of a city, and at no great distance from the following multitudes. But why did our Lord

[1] H. de Sto. Victore (in Trench on *Miracles*, p. 237).

[2] We shall speak more of leprosy hereafter, when we consider others of our Lord's miracles. Perhaps no conception of it can be derived from any source more fearfully than from Lev. xiii., xiv. The reader will find the subject fully and learnedly treated in Jahn's *Archaeologia Biblica*, §§ 188, 189. The rites which accompanied the sacerdotal cleansing of a leper are described at length in Lev. xiv. It was a long process, in two stages. First the priest had to come to him outside the camp or town, to kill a sparrow over fresh water, to dip a living sparrow with cedar-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop into the blood-stained water, to sprinkle the leper seven times with this strange *asperqillum*, and then let the living bird loose, and pronounce the man clean. The man was then to shave off his hair, bathe, remain seven days out of his house; again shave, and bathe, and return to the priest, bringing one lamb for a trespass-offering, and a second with a ewe-lamb for a burnt- and sin-offering (or, if too poor to do this, two young pigeons), and flour and oil for a meat-offering. Some of the blood of the trespass-offering, and some of the oil, was then put, with certain ceremonies, on the tip of his right ear, the thumb of his right hand, and the great toe of his right foot, the rest of the oil being poured upon his head. He was then pronounced clean. There could not well be any dispute about the reality of the cleansing, after ceremonials so elaborate as this, which are the main topic of the Mishnaic tract *Negaim*, in fourteen chapters. Since writing the above note I have read Delitzsch's *Durch Krankheit zur Genesung*, in which the whole rites are elaborately described.

[3] Ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς (Mark i. 44). This probably is the correct reading of B. The expression is much stronger than usual (see xiii. 2; xiv. 2). For other instances of enjoined secrecy see Mark i. 25, 44 (Luke iv. 35; v. 14); Mark iii. 12 (Matt. xii. 16); v. 43 (Luke viii. 56). It will be seen from this that such commands were mainly given in the early part of the ministry.

on this, and many other occasions, enjoin on the recipients of the miracles a secrecy which they so rarely observed? The full reason perhaps we shall never know; but that it had reference to circumstances of time and place, and the mental condition of those in whose favor the deeds were wrought, is clear from the fact that on one occasion at least, where the conditions were different, He even enjoined a publication of the mercy vouchsafed.[1] Was it, as St. Chrysostom conjectures, to repress a spirit of boastfulness, and teach men not to talk away the deep inward sense of God's great gifts? or was it to avoid an over-excitement and tumult in the already astonished multitudes of Galilee?[2] or was it that He might be regarded by them in His true light — not as a mighty Wonder-worker, not as a universal Hakîm, but as a Saviour by Revelation and by Hope?

Whatever may have been the general reasons, it appears that in this case there must have been some reason of special importance. St. Mark, reflecting for us the intense and vivid impressions of St. Peter, shows us, in his terse but most graphic narrative, that the man's dismissal was accompanied on our Saviour's part with some overpowering emotion. Not only is the word, "He straitly charged him" (Mark i. 43), a word implying an extreme earnestness and even vehemence of look and gesture, but the word for "forthwith sent him away" is literally He "pushed" or "drove him forth."[3] What was the cause for this severely inculcated order, for this instantaneous dismissal? Perhaps it was the fact that by touching the leper — though the touch was healing — He would, in the eyes of an unreasoning and unspiritual orthodoxy, be regarded as ceremonially unclean.

[1] The Gadarene demoniac (Mark v. 19; Luke viii. 39).

[2] As is clearly indicated in the beautiful reference to Isa. xlii. in Matt. xii. 15–20. No true Prophet regards such powers as being the real root of the matter. At the best they are *evidential*, and that mainly to the immediate witnesses.

[3] ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ, εὐθέως ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν (Mark i. 43). Euthymius explains this word by αὐστηρῶς ἐμβλέψας καὶ ἐπισείσας τὴν κεφαλήν. It is true that both these words occur elsewhere in the picturesque and energetic Greek of the Gospels, but generally in very strong senses — *e.g.*, Matt. ix. 30, 38; Mark i. 12; xiv. 5; John xi. 33. In Aquila and Symmachus also the word is used of vehement indignation (Ps. vii. 11; Isa. xvii. 13). (Cf. עָגַף, implying *sorrow*, Gen. xl. 6, etc.). Some have supposed that ἐκβαλεῖν, merely in the sense of "send forth," is due to the vagueness of the Hebrew words שָׁלַח and גָּרַשׁ; still a certain vehemence and urgency in our Lord's words to the leper is observable in the change from the third to the first person in Luke v. 14. The ἐξέβαλεν does not imply that the miracle was done in a house; it may mean "from the town" (Alf.).

And that this actually did occur may be assumed from the expressly mentioned fact that, in consequence of the manner in which this incident was blazoned abroad by the cleansed sufferer, "He could not openly enter into a city, but was without in desert places."[1] St. Luke mentions a similar circumstance, though without giving any special reason for it, and adds that Jesus spent the time in prayer.[2] If, however, the dissemination of the leper's story involved the necessity for a short period of seclusion, it is clear that the multitude paid but little regard to this Levitical uncleanness, for even in the lonely spot to which Jesus had retired they thronged to Him from every quarter.

Whether the healing of the centurion's servant[3] took place before or after this retirement is uncertain; but from the fact that both St. Matthew and St. Luke place it in close connection with the Sermon on the Mount, we may suppose that the thronging of the multitudes to seek Him even in desert places, may have shown that it would not be possible for Him to satisfy the scruples of the Legalists by this temporary retirement from human intercourse.

Our Lord had barely reached the town of Capernaum, where He had fixed His temporary home, when He was met by a deputation of Jewish elders[4] probably the *batlanîm* of

[1] Mark i. 45. "It was," says Lange (*Life of Christ*, E. Tr. ii. 443), "a sort of Levitical quarantine." He is wrong, however, in taking πόλιν to mean "*that* city," for St. Mark has not mentioned any city, and the word has no article.

[2] It is interesting to observe that St. Luke, more than the other Evangelists, *constantly* refers to the private prayers of Jesus (iii. 21; vi. 12; ix. 18, 28; xi. 1; xxiii. 34, 46).

[3] Luke vii. 1–10; Matt. viii. 5–13. The points of difference between the healing of the nobleman's son and this miracle are too numerous to admit of our accepting the opinion of those who identify them.

[4] St. Matthew's briefer and less accurate narrative represents the request as coming from the centurion himself, on the every-day principle that "qui facit per alium facit per se." For a similar case, comp. Matt. xx. 20 with Mark x. 35 (Trench on *Miracles*, p. 236). Of course if Inspiration were a *supernatural miraculous* interposition, instead of, as we believe, a guiding and illuminating influence, such apparent discrepancies would not exist. But as the Jews wisely said even of their adored Law, תורה דברה בלשון בני אדם, "the Law speaks with the tongue of the sons of men" (*Gittin*, 41, 3; *Babha Metsia*, 31, 2; *Nedarim*, 2, 1; Reland, *Antt. Hebr.* p. 140), so we say with St. Augustine, that the Evangelists are perfectly sober and truthful witnesses, though they were not in trivial matters miraculously exempted from insignificant imperfections of memory, and speak to us as we speak to each other. I would not go so far as St. Augustine in saying that they wrote "ut quisque meminerat vel ut cuique cordi erat;" but I would ask with him, "An Scriptura Dei aliter nobiscum fuerat quam nostro more locutura?" (*De Cons. Evv.* ii. 20.) In the face of such obvious variations — trivial indeed, yet real — such as exist between

the chief synagogue — to intercede with Him on behalf of a centurion, whose faithful and beloved slave[1] lay in the agony and peril of a paralytic seizure. It might have seemed strange that Jewish elders should take this amount of interest in one who, whether a Roman or not, was certainly a heathen, and may not even have been a "proselyte of the gate."[2] They explained, however, that not only did he love their nation — a thing most rare in a Gentile, for, generally speaking, the Jews were regarded with singular detestation — but had even, at his own expense, built them a synagogue, which, although there must have been several in Capernaum, was sufficiently beautiful and conspicuous to be called "*the* synagogue."[3] The mere fact of their appealing to Jesus shows that this event belongs to an early period of His ministry, when myriads looked to Him with astonishment and hope, and before the deadly exasperation of after days had begun. Christ immediately granted their request. "I will go," He said, "and heal him." But on the way they met other messengers from the humble and devout centurion, entreating Him not to enter the unworthy roof of a Gentile, but to heal the suffering slave (as He had healed the son of the courtier) by a mere word of power. As the centurion,

them, in recording exact words (*e.g.*, those uttered in Gethsemane, or by the Apostles in the sinking ship), and facts (*e.g.*, the order of the Temptations and the Title on the Cross), I do not see how their *supernatural and infallible accuracy*, as apart from their absolutely truthful evidence, can be maintained. As, once more, is observed by St. Augustine, "Per hujusmodi locutiones *varias sed non contrarias* discimus nihil in cujusque verbis nos inspicere debere nisi voluntatem," etc. (ib. ii. 28). "*Diversa* multa," he says elsewhere, "*adversa* nulla esse possunt." The Manichæans, to whom this narrative was very distasteful, tried to reject it on the ground of this very discrepancy. The free and candid manner in which St. Augustine meets and answers them is well worth study. The reader will find some of his most important remarks on this subject quoted or referred to by Archbishop Trench, *Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 48–50.

[1] It has been suggested, and is not impossible, that the ὁ παῖς of St. Matthew's Gospel may have risen out of a confusion from the Hebrew word. St. Luke, however, calls the slave ὁ παῖς μου (vii. 7) as well as St. Matthew.

[2] Alford points out that he is not designated by the terms usually applied to proselytes (*e.g.*, in Acts x. 1, 2). He may have been one of the Samaritan soldiers of Herod Antipas, or he may have been at the head of a small Roman garrison at Capernaum.

[3] Luke vii. 5, τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτὸς (of his own accord) ᾠκοδόμησεν ἡμῖν. There were said to be 400 synagogues in Jerusalem, and if Capernaum be Tell Hûm, there are among its ruins the apparent remains of at least *two* synagogues. Perhaps when the traveller is sitting among the sculptured *débris* of white marble which crowns the low bluff on which Tell Hûm stands, he may be in the ruins of the actual building, which by its splendor attested the centurion's liberal and kindly feelings towards the Jews, and which once rang with the echoes of the voice of Christ

though in a subordinate office, yet had ministers ever ready to do his bidding, so could not Christ bid viewless messengers to perform His will, without undergoing this personal labor? The Lord was struck by so remarkable a faith, greater than any which He had met with even in Israel. He had found in the oleaster what He had not found in the olive;[1] and He drew from this circumstance the lesson, which fell with such a chilling and unwelcome sound on Jewish ears, that when many of the natural children of the kingdom should be cast into outer darkness, many should come from the East and the West, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But the centurion's messengers found on their return that the healing word had been effectual, and that the cherished slave had been restored to health.

It is not strange that, after days so marvellous as these, it was impossible for Jesus to find due repose. From early dawn on the mountain-top to late evening in whatever house He had selected for His nightly rest, the multitudes came crowding about Him, not respecting His privacy, not allowing for His weariness, eager to see Him, eager to share His miracles, eager to listen to His words. There was no time even to eat bread. Such a life is not only to the last degree trying and fatiguing, but to a refined and high-strung nature, rejoicing in noble solitude, finding its purest and most perfect happiness in lonely prayer, this incessant publicity, this apparently illimitable toil becomes simply maddening, unless the spirit be sustained by boundless sympathy and love. But the heart of the Saviour *was* so sustained. It is probably to this period that the remarkable anecdote belongs which is preserved for us by St. Mark alone. The kinsmen and immediate family of Christ, hearing of all that He was doing, came from their home — perhaps at Cana, perhaps at Capernaum — to get possession of His person, to put Him under constraint.[2] Their informants had mistaken the exaltation visible in all His words and actions — the intense

[1] Aug. in Joh. *tr.* xvi.

[2] Mark iii. 21, *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* — a somewhat vague expression — seems something like our colloquial expression "his people." From the curious accident that the word *κρατῆσαι* occurs in the LXX. (2 Kings iv. 8), in immediate connection with "eating bread," Bishop Wordsworth makes the surely too ingenious conjecture "that the mother of Christ supposed that she was imitating the good Shunamite in her conduct to the prophet Elisha, in endeavoring to *constrain them* [qu. Him? unless, indeed, he refers *αὐτὸν* to *τὸν ὄχλον*, which is impossible] *to eat bread*."

glow of compassion — the burning flame of love; they looked upon it as over-excitement, exaggerated sensibility, the very delirium of beneficence and zeal. To the world there has ever been a tendency to confuse the fervor of enthusiasm with the eccentricity of a disordered genius. "Paul, thou art mad," was the only comment which the Apostle's passion of exalted eloquence produced on the cynical and *blasé* intellect of the Roman Procurator.[1] "He hath a devil," was the inference suggested to many dull and worldly hearers after some of the tenderest and divinest sayings of our Lord.[2] "Brother Martin has a fine genius," was the sneering allusion of Pope Leo X. to Luther. "What crack-brained fanatics," observed the fine gentleman of the eighteenth century when they spoke of Wesley and Whitefield. Similar, though not so coarse, was the thought which filled the mind of Christ's wondering relatives, when they heard of this sudden and amazing activity after the calm seclusion of thirty unknown and unnoticed years. As yet they were out of sympathy with Him; they knew Him not, did not fully believe in Him; they said, "He is beside Himself." It was needful that they should be henceforth taught by several decisive proofs that He was not of them; that this was no longer the Carpenter, the brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, but the Son of God, the Saviour of the world.

[1] Acts xxvi. 24. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 13.
[2] John x. 20.

NAIN.

CHAPTER XX.

JESUS AT NAIN.

"Shall the dead arise, and praise thee?" — Ps. lxxxviii. 10.

If the common reading in the text of St. Luke (vii. 11) be right, it was on the very day after these events that our Lord took His way from Capernaum to Nain.[1] Possibly — for, in the dim uncertainties of the chronological sequence, much scope must be left to pure conjecture — the incident of His having touched the leper may have tended to hasten His temporary departure from Capernaum by the comments which the act involved.

Nain — now a squalid and miserable village — is about twenty-five miles from Capernaum, and lies on the north-west slope of Jebel el-Duhy, or Little Hermon. The name (which it still retains) means "fair," and its situation near Endor — nestling picturesquely on the hill-slopes of the graceful mountain, and full in view of Tabor and the heights of Zebulon — justifies the flattering title. Starting, as Orientals always do, early in the cool morning hours, Jesus, in all probability, sailed to the southern end of the lake, and then passed down the Jordan valley, to the spot where the wadys of the Esdraelon slope down to it; from which point, leaving Mount Tabor on the right hand, and Endor on the left, He might easily have arrived at the little village soon after noon.

At this bright and welcome period of His ministry, He was usually accompanied, not only by His disciples, but also by rejoicing and adoring crowds. And as this glad pro-

[1] The narratives of this chapter are mostly peculiar to St. Luke (vii. 11–50). The message of St. John Baptist's disciples is, however, also related by St. Matthew (xi. 2–19). ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς (sc. ἡμέρα) must mean, "on the next day." It is true that the latter word is added in Luke ix. 37; but, on the other hand, it is omitted in Acts xxi. 1; xxv. 17, etc. And when a wider range of time is intended, St. Luke uses ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς; on the other hand, according to Meyer, when ἡμέρᾳ is understood, St. Luke never uses ἐν. See Alford, *ad loc.* Ἐν τῷ is here the reading of A, B, L, etc.; Tischendorf reads τῇ with ℵ (*primâ manu*), C, D, K, etc.

cession, so full of their high hopes and too-often-erring beliefs about the coming King, were climbing the narrow and rocky ascent which leads to the gate of Nain, they were met by another and a sad procession issuing through it to bury a dead youth outside the walls.[1] There was a pathos deeper than ordinary in the spectacle, and therefore probably, in that emotional race, a wail wilder and sincerer than the ordinary lamentation. For this boy was — in language which is all the more deeply moving from its absolute simplicity, and which to Jewish ears would have involved a sense of anguish yet deeper than to ours[2] — "the only son of his mother, and she a widow." The sight of this terrible sorrow appealed irresistibly to the Saviour's loving and gentle heart. Pausing only to say to the mother, "Weep not," He approached, and — heedless once more of purely ceremonial observances — touched the bier, or rather the open coffin in which the dead youth lay. It must have been a moment of intense and breathless expectation. Unbidden, but filled with indefinable awe, the bearers of the bier stood still. And then through the hearts of the stricken mourners, and through the hearts of the silent multitude, there thrilled the calm utterance, "Young man, arise!" Would that dread monosyllable[3] thrill also through the unknown mysterious solitudes of death? would it thrill through the impenetrable darkness of the more-than-midnight which has ever concealed from human vision the world beyond the grave? It did. The dead got up, and began to speak; and He delivered him to his mother.

No wonder that a great fear fell upon all. They might have thought of Elijah and the widow of Sarepta; of Elisha and the lady of the not far distant Shunem. They too, the greatest of the Prophets, had restored to lonely women their dead only sons. But *they* had done it with agonies and energies of supplication, wrestling in prayer, and lying out-

[1] The ordinary Jewish custom. The rough path near the entrance of *Nein* must be added to the *certain* sites of events in the life of Christ. The rock-hewn sepulchres on the hill-side may well be as old as the time of Christ, and it is probably to one of them that the youth's body was being carried.

[2] Partly because to die childless was to them a terrible calamity; partly because the loss of offspring was often regarded as a direct punishment for sin (Jer. vi. 26; Zech. xii. 10; Amos viii. 10).

[3] קוּם. *kûm!* It is at least natural to suppose that our Lord used the same Aramaic word as to the daughter of Jairus, "Talitha cûmi" (Mark v. 41).

stretched upon the dead;[1] whereas Jesus had wrought that miracle calmly, incidentally, instantaneously, in His own name, by His own authority, with a single word. Could they judge otherwise than that "God had visited His people"?

It was about this time, possibly even on this same day,[2] that our Lord received a short but agitated message from His own great Forerunner, John the Baptist. Its very brevity added to the sense of doubt and sadness which it breathed. "Art Thou," he asked, "the coming Messiah, or are we to expect another?"[3]

Was this a message from him who had first recognized and pointed out the Lamb of God? from him who, in the rapture of vision, had seen heaven opened and the Spirit descending on the head of Jesus like a dove?

It may be so. Some have indeed imagined that the message was merely intended to satisfy the doubts of the Baptist's jealous and disheartened followers; some, that his question only meant, "Art Thou indeed the Jesus to whom I bore my testimony?"[4] some, that the message implied *no* latent hesitation, but was intended as a timid suggestion that the time was now come for Jesus to manifest Himself as the Messiah of His nation's theocratic hopes — perhaps even as a gentle rebuke to Him for allowing His friend and Forerunner to languish in a dungeon, and not exerting on his behalf the miraculous power of which these rumors told. But these suggestions — all intended, as it were, to save the credit of the Baptist — are at the best wholly unauthorized, and are partly refuted by the actual expressions of the narrative. St. John Baptist in his heroic greatness needs not the poor aid of our charitable suppositions: we conclude,

[1] 1 Kings xvii. 21; 2 Kings iv. 35.

[2] Matt. xi. 2–19; Luke vii. 18–35. — I am well aware of what Stier and others say to the contrary; but it is impossible and wholly unnecessary to give separate reasons and proofs at each step of the narrative.

[3] The ἕτερον of Matt. xi. 3 would strictly mean either "a second" or "one quite different;" but as the messenger doubtless spoke in Aramaic, the variation from the ἄλλον of Luke vii. 19 must not be pressed.

[4] The main argument for this is that in Matt. xi. 2 it says that John had heard in prison the works of the Messiah (τοῦ Χριστοῦ), not as elsewhere in St. Matthew, τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. It must be borne in mind that in the Gospels "Christ" is always a *title*, scarcely ever a *proper name*. It did not become a name till after the Resurrection. Moreover, it appears that some of the rumors about Jesus were that He was Elijah, or Jeremiah, and these may have tended to confuse the prison-clouded mind of John (Just. Mart., *Quæst. ad. Orthod.* 34, quoted by Alford). Dr. Lightfoot (on *Revision*, p. 100) says that Χριστὸς is never found in the Gospels with Ἰησοῦς, except in John xvii. 3 (but add Matt. i. 1, 18; Mark i. 1).

from the express words of Him who at this very crisis pronounced upon him the most splendid eulogy ever breathed over mortal man, that the great and noble prophet had indeed, for the moment, found a stumbling-block to his faith in what he heard about the Christ.[1]

And is this unnatural? is it an indecision which any one who knows anything of the human heart will venture for a moment to condemn? The course of the greatest of the Prophets had been brief and tragical — a sad calendar of disaster and eclipse. Though all men flocked in multitudes to listen to the fiery preacher of the wilderness, the real effect on the mind of the nation had been neither permanent nor deep.[2] We may say with the Scotch poet —

> "Who listened to his voice? obeyed his cry?
> Only the echoes which he made relent
> Rang from their flinty caves, 'Repent! repent!'"

Even before Jesus had come forth in the fulness of His ministry, the power and influence of John had paled like a star before the sunrise. He must have felt very soon — and that is a very bitter thing for any human heart to feel — that his mission for this life was over; that nothing appreciable remained for him to do. Similar moments of intense and heart-breaking despondency had already occurred in the lives of his very greatest predecessors — in the lives of even a Moses and an Elijah. But the case was far worse with John the Baptist than with them. For though his Friend and his Saviour was living, was at no great distance from him, was in the full tide of His influence, and was daily working the miracles of love which attested His mission, yet John saw that Friend and Saviour on earth no more. There were no visits to console, no intercourse to sustain him; he was surrounded only by the coldness of listeners whose curiosity had waned, and the jealousy of disciples whom his main testimony had disheartened. And then came the miserable climax. Herod Antipas — the pettiest, meanest, weakest, most contemptible of titular princelings — partly influenced by political fears, partly enraged by John's just and blunt rebuke of his adulterous life, though at first he had listened to the Baptist with the superstition which is the usual concomitant of cunning, had ended by an uxorious concession to the hatred of Herodias, and had flung him into prison.

[1] Matt. xi. 11.
[2] Matt. xi. 18; xxi. 23–27; John v. 35.

Josephus tells us that this prison was the fortress of Machærus, or Makor, a strong and gloomy castle, built by Alexander Jannæus and strengthened by Herod the Great — on the borders of the desert, to the north of the Dead Sea, and on the frontiers of Arabia.[1] We know enough of solitary castles and Eastern dungeons to realize what horrors must have been involved for any man in such an imprisonment; what possibilities of agonizing torture, what daily risk of a violent and unknown death. How often in the world's history have even the most generous and dauntless spirits been crushed and effeminated by such hopeless captivity. When the first noble rage, or heroic resignation, is over — when the iron-hearted endurance is corroded by forced inactivity and maddening solitude — when the great heart is cowed by the physical lassitude and despair of a life left to rot away in the lonely darkness — who can be answerable for the level of depression to which he may sink? Savonarola, and Jerome of Prague, and Luther were men whose courage, like that of the Baptist, had enabled them to stand unquailing before angry councils and threatening kings: will any one, in forming an estimate of their goodness and their greatness, add one shade of condemnation because of the wavering of the first and of the second in the prison-cells of Florence and Constance, or the phantasies of incipient madness which agitated, in the castle of Wartburg, the ardent spirit of the third? And yet to St. John Baptist imprisonment must have been a deadlier thing than even to Luther; for in the free wild life of the hermit he had lived in constant communion with the sights and sounds of nature, had breathed with delight and liberty the free winds of the wilderness, and gazed with a sense of companionship on the large stars which beam from the clear vault of the Eastern night. To a child of freedom and of passion, to a rugged, passionate, untamed spirit like that of John, a prison was worse than death. For the palms of Jericho and the balsams of Engedi, for the springing of the beautiful gazelles amid the mountain solitudes, and the reflection of the moonlight on the mysterious waves of the Salt Lake, he had nothing now but the chilly damps and cramping fetters of a dungeon, and the brutalities of such a jailer as a tetrarch like Antipas would have kept in a fortress like Makor. In

[1] Hitzig says that מכֶוָר means "diadem." The ruins of it have rarely been visited, but were discovered, or at any rate heard of, by Seetzen in 1807.

that black prison, among its lava streams and basaltic rocks, which was tenanted in reality by far worse demons of human brutality and human vice than the "goats" and "satyrs" and doleful creatures believed by Jewish legend to haunt its whole environment, we cannot wonder if the eye of the caged eagle began to film.

Not once or twice alone in the world's history has God seemed to make His very best and greatest servants drink to the very dregs the cup of apparent failure — called them suddenly away by the sharp stroke of martyrdom, or down the long declivities of a lingering disease, before even a distant view of their work has been vouchsafed to them; flung them, as it were, aside like broken instruments, useless for their destined purpose, ere he crowned with an immortality of success and blessing the lives which fools regarded as madness, and the end that has been without human honor. It is but a part of that merciful fire in which He is purging away the dross from the seven-times-refined gold of a spirit which shall be worthy of eternal bliss. But to none could this disciplinary tenderness have come in more terrible disguise than to St. John. For he seemed to be neglected not only by God above, but by the living Son of God on earth. John was pining in Herod's prison while Jesus, in the glad simplicity of His early Galilæan ministry, was preaching to rejoicing multitudes among the mountain lilies or from the waves of the pleasant lake. Oh, why did his Father in heaven and his Friend on earth suffer him to languish in this soul-clouding misery? Had not his life been innocent? had not his ministry been faithful? had not his testimony been true? Oh, why did not He, to whom he had borne witness beyond Jordan, call down fire from heaven to shatter those foul and guilty towers? Among so many miracles might not *one* be spared to the unhappy kinsman who had gone before His face to prepare His way before Him? Among so many words of mercy and tenderness might not *some* be vouchsafed to him who had uttered that Voice in the wilderness? Why should not the young Son of David rock with earthquake the foundations of these Idumæan prisons, where many a noble captive has been unjustly slain, or send but one of His twelve legions of angels to liberate His Forerunner and His friend, were it but to restore him to his desert solitude once more — content there to end his life among the wild beasts, so it were far from man's tyrannous infamy, and under God's open sky? What wonder, we say again, if the eye of the caged eagle began to film!

"Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?"

Jesus did not directly answer the question. He showed the messengers, He let them see with their own eyes, some of the works of which hitherto they had only heard by the hearing of the ear. And then with a reference to the 61st chapter of Isaiah, He bade them take back to their master the message, that blind men saw, and lame walked, and lepers were cleansed, and deaf heard, and dead were raised;[1] and above all, and more than all, that to the poor the glad tidings were being preached: and then, we can imagine with how deep a tenderness, He added, "And blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me" — blessed (that is) is he who shall trust me, even in spite of sorrow and persecution — he who shall believe that I know to the utmost the will of Him that sent me, and how and when to finish His work.

We may easily suppose, though nothing more is told us, that the disciples did not depart without receiving from Jesus other words of private affection and encouragement for the grand prisoner whose end was now so nearly approaching — words which would be to him sweeter than the honey which had sustained his hunger in the wilderness, dearer than water-springs in the dry ground. And no sooner had the disciples departed, than He who would not seem to be guilty of idle flattery, but yet wished to prevent His hearers from cherishing one depreciatory thought of the great Prophet of the Desert, uttered over His friend and Forerunner, in language of rhythmic and perfect loveliness, the memorable eulogy, that he was indeed the promised Voice in the new dawn of a nobler day, the greatest of all God's herald messengers — the Elias who, according to the last word of ancient prophecy, was to precede the Advent of the Messiah, and to prepare His way.

"What went ye out into the wilderness for to see?
"A reed shaken by the wind?
"But what went ye out for to see?
"A man clothed in soft raiment?
"Behold, they that wear soft clothing are in *kings'* houses![2]

[1] Even if the spiritual meaning did not predominate in these expressions, as seems to be clear from the words which formed their climax, yet the recent miracle at Nain would alone suffice to justify this allusion. I may observe here that I quote from these latter chapters of "Isaiah" without thinking it necessary to call the writer of them, as Ewald does, "the Great Unnamed."

[2] "Those in gorgeous apparel and luxury," is the slight variation in St.

"But what went ye out for to see?

"A prophet?

"Yea, I say unto you, and far more than a prophet. For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before Thy face, who shall prepare Thy way before Thee."

And having pronounced this rhythmic and impassioned eulogy, he proceeded to speak to them more calmly respecting Himself and John, and to tell them that though John was the last and greatest of the Old Dispensation, yet the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he. The brevity with which the words are repeated leaves their meaning uncertain; but the superiority intended is a superiority doubtless in spiritual privileges, not in moral exaltation. "The least of that which is greatest," says a legal maxim, "is greater than the greatest of that which is least;"[1] and in revealed knowledge, in illimitable hope, in conscious closeness of relationship to his Father and his God, the humblest child of the New Covenant is more richly endowed than the greatest prophet of the Old. And into that kingdom of God whose advent was now proclaimed, henceforth with holy and happy violence they all might press. Such eager violence — natural to those who hunger and thirst after righteousness — would be only acceptable in the sight of God.[2]

Many who heard these words, and especially the publicans and those who were scorned as the "people of the earth,"[3] accepted with joy and gratitude this approbation of their confidence in John. But there were others — the accredited teachers of the written and oral Law — who listened to such words with contemptuous dislike. Struck with these contrasts, Jesus drew an illustration from peevish children who fretfully reject every effort of their fellows to delight or to amuse them. Nothing could please such soured and rebellious natures. The flute and dance of the little ones who played at weddings charmed them as little as the long wail of the simulated funeral. God's "richly variegated wisdom" had been exhibited to them in many fragments, and by many

Luke. John, too, had been in kings' houses, but it was in hairy mantle, and not to praise, but to denounce. As Lange finely observes, John was not a reed waving in the wind, but rather a cedar half-uprooted by the storm.

[1] Maldonatus, quoted by Meyer — "*minimum maximi est majus maximo minimi.*"

[2] Cf. Isa. lx. 8, 11; Luke v. 1; xiii. 24.

[3] The *am ha-arets*, or as we should say, "mere boors."

methods,[1] yet all in vain. John had come to them in the stern asceticism of the hermit, and they called him mad; Jesus joined in the banquet and the marriage feast, and they called Him an eater and a wine-drinker.[2] Even so! yet Wisdom has been ever justified at her children's hands. Those children have not disgraced their divine original. Fools might account their life as madness, and their end to be without honor; but how is the very humblest of them numbered among the children of God, and their lot among the saints![3]

[1] ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία (Eph. iii. 10); πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως (Heb. i. 1).

[2] Matt. xi. 16–19; Luke vii. 31–35. The A. V., "a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber," is perhaps a shade too strong; the words do not necessarily mean more than a *bon vivant*, but perhaps they correspond to expressions which connoted something more in Aramaic. φάγος does not occur in the LXX., but οἰνοπότης is found in Prov. xxiii. 20.

[3] Wisd. v. 4, 5; cf. Ps. li. 4; Rom. iii. 4. I have embodied into the text, without expansion, reference, or comment, the view which seems to me the best; and I have followed the same method of dealing with many other passages of which the exegesis is confessedly difficult, and to some extent uncertain. I cannot accept Ewald's notion that the allusion is to a kind of "guessing-game," where the children had to pay forfeit if they failed to understand the scene which their fellows were acting.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE SINNER AND THE PHARISEE.

"Because of the savor of thy good ointments thy name is as ointment poured forth." — CANT. i. 3.

BUT not even yet apparently were the deeds and sayings of this memorable day concluded; for in the narrative of St. Luke it seems to have been on the same day that, perhaps at Nain, perhaps at Magdala, Jesus received and accepted an invitation from one of the Pharisees who bore the very common name of Simon.[1]

The cause or object of the invitation we do not know; but as yet Jesus had come to no marked or open rupture with the Pharisaic party, and they may even have imagined that He might prove of use to them as the docile instrument of their political and social purposes. Probably, in inviting Him, Simon was influenced partly by curiosity, partly by the desire to receive a popular and distinguished teacher, partly by willingness to show a distant approval of something which may have struck him in Christ's looks, or words, or ways. It is quite clear that the hospitality was meant to be qualified and condescending. All the ordinary attentions which would have been paid to an honored guest were

[1] Luke vii. 36–50. Those who identify this feast at the house of Simon the Pharisee, in Galilee, with the long-subsequent feast at the house of Simon the leper, at Bethany, and the anointing of the feet by "a woman that was a sinner in the city," with the anointing of the head by Mary the sister of Martha, adopt principles of criticism so reckless and arbitrary that their general acceptance would rob the Gospels of all credibility, and make them hardly worth study as truthful narratives. As for the names Simon and Judas, which have led to so many identifications of different persons and different incidents, they were at least as common among the Jews of that day as Smith and Jones among ourselves. There are five or six Judes, and nine Simons mentioned in the New Testament, and two Judes and two Simons among the Apostles alone. Josephus speaks of some *ten* Judes and *twenty* Simons in his writings, and there must, therefore, have been thousands of others who at this period had one of these two names. The incident is one quite in accordance with the customs of the time and country, and there is not the least improbability in its repetition under different circumstances (Eccles ix. 8; Cant. iv. 10; Amos vi. 6; *Jer. Berachôth*, f. 11, 2; Sen. *Ep.* 86; Aul. Gell. vii. 12, etc.). The custom still continues (Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 385).

coldly and cautiously omitted. There was no water for the weary and dusty feet, no kiss of welcome upon the cheek, no perfume for the hair, nothing but a somewhat ungracious admission to a vacant place at the table, and the most distant courtesies of ordinary intercourse, so managed that the Guest might feel that he was supposed to be receiving an honor, and not to be conferring one.

In order that the mats or carpets which are hallowed by domestic prayer may not be rendered unclean by any pollution of the streets, each guest, as he enters a house in Syria or Palestine, takes off his sandals, and leaves them at the door. He then proceeds to his place at the table. In ancient times, as we find throughout the Old Testament,[1] it was the custom of the Jews to eat their meals sitting cross-legged — as is still common throughout the East — in front of a tray placed on a low stool, on which is set the dish containing the heap of food, from which all help themselves in common. But this custom, though it has been resumed for centuries, appears to have been abandoned by the Jews in the period succeeding the Captivity. Whether they had borrowed the recumbent posture at meals from the Persians or not, it is certain, from the expressions employed, that in the time of our Lord the Jews, like the Greeks and Romans, reclined at banquets,[2] upon couches placed around tables of much the same height as those now in use. We shall see hereafter that even the Passover was eaten in this attitude. The beautiful and profoundly moving incident which occurred in Simon's house can only be understood by remembering that as the guests lay on the couches which surrounded the tables, their feet would be turned towards any spectators who were standing outside the circle of bidden guests.

An Oriental's house is by no means his castle. The universal prevalence of the law of hospitality — the very first of Eastern virtues — almost forces him to live with open doors, and any one may at any time have access to his rooms.[3] But on this occasion there was one who had summoned up

[1] The word is generally יָשַׁב (Gen. xxvii. 19), or סָבַב (1 Sam. xvi. 11, "We will not *sit round*;" cf. 1 Sam. xx. 5, 18; Ps. cxxviii. 3; Cant. i. 12, etc.); and we do not hear of reclining till the Exile (Esth. i. 6; vii. 8).

[2] The words used are *ἀναπίπτειν* (Luke xi. 37; John xxi. 20; Tobit ii. 1), *ἀνακεῖσθαι* (Luke vii. 37; cf. 3 Esdras iv. 10), *ἀνακλίνεσθαι* (Luke vii. 36; xii. 37; Judith xii. 15); cf. *ὀρχιτρίκλινος* (John ii. 8).

[3] The author had opportunities of observing this in Palestine. When we were at a Sheykh's house, the population took a great interest in inspecting us.

courage to intrude upon that respectable dwelling-place a presence which was not only unwelcome, but positively odious. A poor, stained, fallen woman, notorious in the place for her evil life, discovering that Jesus was supping in the house of the Pharisee,[1] ventured to make her way there among the throng of other visitants, carrying with her an alabaster box of spikenard. She found the object of her search, and as she stood humbly behind Him, and listened to His words, and thought of all that He was, and all to which she had fallen — thought of the stainless, sinless purity of the holy and youthful Prophet, and of her own shameful, degraded life — she began to weep, and her tears dropped fast upon His unsandalled feet, over which she bent lower and lower to hide her confusion and her shame. The Pharisee would have started back with horror from the touch, still more from the tear, of such an one; he would have wiped away the fancied pollution, and driven off the presumptuous intruder with a curse. But this woman felt instinctively that Jesus would not treat her so; she felt that the highest sinlessness is also the deepest sympathy; she saw that where the hard respectability of her fellow-sinner would repel, the perfect holiness of her Saviour would receive. Perhaps she had heard those infinitely tender and gracious words which may have been uttered on this very day[2] — "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." And she was emboldened by being unreproved; and thus becoming conscious that, whatever others might do, the Lord at any rate did not loathe or scorn her, she drew yet nearer to Him, and, sinking down upon her knees, began with her long dishevelled hair to wipe the feet which had been wetted with her tears, and then to cover them with kisses, and at last — breaking the alabaster vase — to bathe them with the precious and fragrant nard.[3]

The sight of that dishevelled woman, the shame of her humiliation, the agonies of her penitence, the quick dropping of her tears, the sacrifice of that perfume which had been one of the instruments of her unhallowed arts, might have touched

[1] ἐπιγνοῦσα (Luke vii. 37).

[2] They are given by St. Matthew in close connection with the preceding events (xi. 28); it is, however, clear that St. Matthew is here recording discourses, or parts of discourses, which belong to different times.

[3] The word ἀλάβαστρον is generic, *i.e.*, it describes the use to which the little phial was put, not necessarily the material of which it was made. [Cf. χοῦσαι ἀλάβαστρα (Theocr., *Id.* xv. 114) and the use of our word *box*; Herod. iii. 20; Arist. *Ach.* 1053, etc.]

even the stoniest feelings into an emotion of sympathy. But Simon, the Pharisee, looked on with icy dislike and disapproval. The irresistible appeal to pity of that despairing and broken-hearted mourner did not move him. It was not enough for him that Jesus had but suffered the unhappy creature to kiss and anoint His feet, without speaking to her as yet one word of encouragement. Had He been a prophet, He ought to have known what kind of woman she was; and had He known, He ought to have repulsed her with contempt and indignation, as Simon would himself have done. Her mere touch almost involved the necessity of a ceremonial quarantine. One sign from Him, and Simon would have been only too glad of an excuse for ejecting such a pollution from the shelter of his roof.

The Pharisee did not utter these thoughts aloud, but his frigid demeanor, and the contemptuous expression of countenance, which he did not take the trouble to disguise, showed all that was passing in his heart. Our Lord heard his thoughts,[1] but did not at once reprove and expose his cold uncharity and unrelenting hardness. In order to call general attention to His words, He addressed His host.

"Simon, I have something to say to thee."

"Master, say on," is the somewhat constrained reply.

"There was a certain creditor who had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty; and when they had nothing to pay, he freely forgave them both. Tell me then, which of them will love him the most?"

Simon does not seem to have had the slightest conception that the question had any reference to himself — as little conception as David had when he pronounced so frank a judgment on Nathan's parable.

"I imagine," he said — there is a touch of supercilious patronage, of surprised indifference to the whole matter in the word he uses[2] — "I presume that he to whom he forgave most."

"Thou has rightly judged." And then — the sterner for its very gentleness and forbearance — came the moral and application of the little tale, couched in that rhythmic utterance of antithetic parallelism which our Lord often adopted in His loftier teaching, and which appealed like the poetry of their own prophets to the ears of those who heard it.

[1] "Audivit Pharisaeum cogitantem" (Aug., *Serm.* xcix.). "Guard well thy thoughts, for thoughts are heard in heaven."

[2] Luke vii. 43, ὑπολαμβάνω. Cf. Acts ii. 15.

Though Simon may not have seen the point of the parable, perhaps the penitent, with the quicker intuition of a contrite heart, *had* seen it. But what must have been her emotion when He who hitherto had not noticed her, now turned full towards her, and calling the attention of all who were present to her shrinking figure, as she sat upon the ground, hiding with her two hands and with her dishevelled hair the confusion of her face, exclaimed to the astonished Pharisee —

"Simon! dost thou mark[1] this woman?

"I was thine own guest: thou pouredst no water over my feet; but she, with her tears, washed my feet, and with her hair she wiped them.

"No kiss gavest thou to me; but she, since the time I came in, has been ceaselessly covering my feet with kisses.[2]

"My head with oil thou anointedst not; but she with spikenard anointed my feet.

"Wherefore I say to you, her sins — her many sins, have been forgiven; but he to whom there is but little forgiveness, loveth little."

And then like the rich close of gracious music, he added, no longer to Simon, but to the poor sinful woman, the words of mercy, "Thy sins have been forgiven."

Our Lord's words were constantly a new revelation for all who heard them, and if we may judge from many little indications in the Gospels, they seem often to have been followed, in the early days of His ministry, by a shock of surprised silence, which at a later date, among those who rejected Him, broke out into fierce reproaches and indignant murmurs. At this stage of His work, the spell of awe and majesty produced by His love and purity, and by that inward Divinity which shone in His countenance and sounded in His voice, had not yet been broken. It was only in their secret thoughts that the guests — rather, it seems, in astonishment than in wrath — ventured to question this calm and simple claim to a more than earthly attritube. It was only in their hearts that they silently mused and questioned, "Who is this, who forgiveth sins also?" Jesus knew their inward hesitations; but it had been prophesied of Him that "He should not

[1] *βλέπεις*, not *δρᾷς* (ver. 44). Perhaps Simon had disdained even to look at her attentively, as though even *that* would stain his sanctity! The "I was thine own guest" is an attempt to bring out the force of the *σοὺ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν*. The *ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας* implies the pouring. Cf. Rev. viii. 3; Gen. xviii. 4; Judg. xix. 21.

[2] There is a contrast between the mere *φίλημα* and the *καταφιλοῦσα* (ver. 45).

strive nor cry, neither should His voice be heard in the streets;" and because He would not break the bruised reed of their faith, or quench the smoking flax of their reverent amazement, He gently sent away the woman who had been a sinner with the kind words, "Thy faith hath saved thee: go into peace."[1] And to peace beyond all doubt she went, even to the peace of God which passeth all understanding, to the peace which Jesus gives, which is not as the world gives. To the general lesson which her story inculcates we shall return hereafter, for it is one which formed a central doctrine of Christ's revelation; I mean the lesson that cold and selfish hypocrisy is in the sight of God as hateful as more glaring sin; the lesson that a life of sinful and impenitent respectability may be no less deadly and dangerous than a life of open shame. But meanwhile the touching words of an English poet may serve as the best comment on this beautiful incident: —

> "She sat and wept beside His feet; the weight
> Of sin oppressed her heart; for all the blame
> And the poor malice of the worldly shame,
> To her were past, extinct, and out of date;
> Only the sin remained — the leprous *state*.
> She would be melted by the heat of love,
> By fires far fiercer than are blown to prove
> And purge the silver ore adulterate.
> She sat and wept, and with her untressed hair,
> Still wiped the feet she was so blessed to touch;
> And He wiped off the soiling of despair
> From her sweet soul, because she loved so much."[2]

An ancient tradition — especially prevalent in the Western Church, and followed by the translators of our English version — a tradition which, though it must ever remain uncertain, is not in itself improbable, and cannot be disproved — identifies this woman with Mary of Magdala, "out of whom Jesus cast seven devils."[3] This exorcism is

[1] Verse 50, εἰς εἰρήνην, not only "in," but "*to* or *for* peace;" the Hebrew לְשָׁלוֹם.

[2] Hartley Coleridge.

[3] This tradition is alluded to by Ambrose (*in Luc.*), Jerome (in Matt. xxvi. 6), and Augustine (*De Cons. Evang.* 69), and accepted by Gregory the Great (*Hom. in Evv.* 33). Any one who has read my friend Professor Plumptre's article on "Mary Magdalene," in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, will perhaps be surprised that I accept even the *possibility* of this identification, which he calls "a figment utterly baseless." I have partly answered the supposed objections to the identification in the text, and mainly differ from Professor Plumptre in his view of the "seven demons." This, he says, is incompatible with the life implied by the word ἁμαρτωλός. To

not elsewhere alluded to, and it would be perfectly in accordance with the genius of Hebrew phraseology if the expression had been applied to her, in consequence of a passionate nature and an abandoned life. The Talmudists have much to say respecting her — her wealth, her extreme beauty, her braided locks, her shameless profligacy, her husband Pappus, and her paramour Pandera;[1] but all that we really know of the Magdalene from Scripture is that enthusiasm of devotion and gratitude which attached her, heart and soul, to her Saviour's service. In the chapter of St. Luke which follows this incident she is mentioned first among the women who accompanied Jesus in his wanderings, and ministered to Him of their substance;[2] and it may be that in the narrative of the incident at Simon's house her name was suppressed, out of that delicate consideration which, in other passages, makes the Evangelist suppress the condition of Matthew and the name of Peter. It may be, indeed, that the woman who was a sinner went to find the peace which Christ had promised to her troubled conscience in a life of deep seclusion and obscurity, which meditated in silence on the merciful forgiveness of her Lord; but in the popular consciousness she will till the end of time be identified with the Magdalene whose very name has passed into all civilized languages as a synonym for accepted penitence and pardoned sin. The traveller who, riding among the delicate perfumes of many flowering plants on the shores of Gennesareth, comes to the ruinous tower and solitary palm-tree that mark the Arab village of El Mejdel, will involuntarily recall this old tradition of her whose sinful beauty and deep repentance have made the name of Magdala so famous; and though the few miserable peasant huts are squalid and ruinous, and the inhabitants are living in ignorance and degradation, he will still look with interest and emotion on a site which brings back into his memory one of the most signal proofs that no one — not even the most fallen and the most despised — is regarded as an outcast by Him whose very work it was to seek and save that which was lost. Perhaps in the balmy air of Gennes-

which I reply by referring to Luke iv. 33; Matt. x. 1, etc. Gregory the Great rightly held that the "seven demons" *may* have been applied to the "many sins," for Lightfoot has shown that the Rabbis ascribed drunkenness and lust to the *immediate* agency of demons (*v. supr.*, p. 236).

[1] The reader will, I am sure, excuse me from the tedious task of reproducing all these venomous and absurd fictions, which are as devoid of literary as they are of historic value.

[2] viii. 2.

areth, in the brightness of the sky above his head, in the sound of the singing birds which fills the air, in the masses of purple blossom which at some seasons of the year festoons these huts of mud, he may see a type of the love and tenderness which is large and rich enough to encircle with the grace of fresh and heavenly beauty the ruins of a once earthly and desecrated life.[1]

[1] Any one who cares to see the various plays on, and derivations suggested for, the name Magdalene, can do so in Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, in Matt. xxvi. 6, and Professor Plumptre *ubi supr.* Nothing can be inferred against its meaning "of Magdala" from the ἡ καλουμένη of Luke viii. 2.

CHAPTER XXII.

JESUS AS HE LIVED IN GALILEE.

τὸ γὰρ πάθος Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν ἀπάθεια ἐστιν . . . καὶ τὸ δάκρυον αὐτοῦ χαρα ἡμετερα.— ATHAN., *De Incarn.*

IT is to this period of our Lord's earlier ministry that those mission journeys belong — those circuits through the towns and villages of Galilee, teaching, and preaching, and performing works of mercy — which are so frequently alluded to in the first three Gospels, and which are specially mentioned at this point of the narrative by the Evangelist St. Luke. "He walked in Galilee."[1] It was the brightest, hopefullest, most active episode in His life. Let us, in imagination, stand aside and see Him pass, and so, with all humility and reverence, set before us as vividly as we can what manner of man He was.

Let us then suppose ourselves to mingle with any one fragment of those many multitudes which at this period awaited Him at every point of His career, and let us gaze on Him as they did when he was a man on earth.[2]

[1] Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35; Mark i. 39; Luke iv. 15, 44; John vii. 1: *περιεπάτει* — "ambulando docebat" (Bretschneider). In this part of the narrative I mainly follow St. Luke's order, only varying from it where there seems reason for doing so. I have, however, already stated my disbelief in the possibility of a final harmony; and in a few instances where no special order is discernible in the narrative of the Evangelists, I have followed a plan distinctly sanctioned by the practice of St. Matthew — viz., that of grouping together events which have a subjective connection. Any one who has long and carefully studied the Gospels has probably arrived at a strong opinion as to the possible or even probable order of events; but when he sees no two independent harmonists agreeing even in the common chronological principles or data (*e.g.*, even as to the number of years in Christ's ministry), he will probably feel that the order he adopts will carry no conviction to others, however plausible it may seem to himself. I agree, however, more nearly with Lange and Stier — though by no means adopting their entire arrangement — than with most other writers.

[2] The general idea of this chapter, and many of its details, were suggested to me by an exceedingly beautiful and interesting little tract of Dr. F. Delitzsch, called *Sehet welch ein Mensch.* Ein Geschichtsgemälde. (Leipzig, 1869.) Some may perhaps consider that both Dr. Delitzsch and I have given too much scope to the imagination; but, with the exception of one or two references to early tradition, they will scarcely find an incident, or even an expression, which is not sanctioned by notices in the Evangelists.

We are on that little plain[1] that runs between the hills of Zebulon and Naphtali, somewhere between the villages of Kefr Kenna and the so-called Kana el-Jalîl. A sea of corn, fast yellowing to the harvest, is around us, and the bright, innumerable flowers that broider the wayside are richer and larger than those of home. The path on which we stand leads in one direction to Accho and the coast, in the other over the summit of Hattîn to the Sea of Galilee. The land is lovely with all the loveliness of a spring day in Palestine, but the hearts of the eager, excited crowd, in the midst of which we stand, are too much occupied by one absorbing thought to notice its beauty; for some of them are blind, and sick, and lame, and they know not whether to-day a finger of mercy, a word of healing — nay, even the touch of the garment of this great Unknown Prophet as He passes by — may not alter and gladden the whole complexion of their future lives. And farther back, at a little distance from the crowd, standing among the wheat, with covered lips, and warning off all who approach them with the cry, *Tamê, Tamê* — "Unclean! unclean!" — clad in mean and scanty garments, are some fearful and mutilated figures whom, with a shudder, we recognize as lepers.[2]

The comments of the crowd show that many different motives have brought them together. Some are there from interest, some from curiosity, some from the vulgar contagion of enthusiasm which they cannot themselves explain. Marvellous tales of Him — of His mercy, of His power, of His gracious words, of His mighty deeds — are passing from lip to lip, mingled, doubtless, with suspicions and calumnies. One or two Scribes and Pharisees who are present, holding themselves a little apart from the crowd, whisper to each other their perplexities, their indignation, their alarm.

Suddenly over the rising ground, at no great distance, is seen the cloud of dust which marks an approaching company; and a young boy of Magdala or Bethsaida, heedless of the scornful reproaches of the Scribes, points in that direction, and runs excitedly forward with the shout of *Malka Meshîchah! Malka Meshîchah* — "the King Messiah! the King Messiah!" — which even on youthful lips must have quickened the heart-beats of a simple Galilæan throng.[3]

[1] Asochis; now called El Buttauf.

[2] טָמֵא (Lev. xiii. 45; Numb. vi. 9). Cf. Ezek. xxiv. 17, "cover not thy lips."

[3] I take the supposed incident in part from Dr. Delitzsch; and after the

And now the throng approaches. It is a motley multitude of young and old, composed mainly of peasants, but with others of higher rank interspersed in their loose array — here a frowning Pharisee, there a gayly clad Herodian[1] whispering to some Greek merchant or Roman soldier his scoffing comments on the enthusiasm of the crowd. But these are the few, and almost every eye of that large throng is constantly directed towards One who stands in the centre of the separate group which the crowd surrounds.

In the front of this group walk some of the newly chosen Apostles: behind are others, among whom there is one whose restless glance and saturnine countenance[2] accord but little with that look of openness and innocence which stamps his comrades as honest men. Some of those who are looking on whisper that he is a certain Judas of Kerioth, almost the only follower of Jesus who is not a Galilæan. A little further in the rear, behind the remainder of the Apostles, are four or five women,[3] some on foot, some on mules, among

announcement of John the Baptist (John i. 26, 32, etc.), and such incidents as those recorded in Luke iv. 41, the surmise of John iv. 29; vii. 41 must have been on many lips.

[1] In the Talmudic legend of the apostasy of Menahem and his 160 scholars from the school of Hillel to the service of Herod לצכורת המלך; *Chagiga.* f. 16, 2; Reland, *Antt. Hebr.*, p. 251), one sign of their abandonment of the Oral Law was glittering apparel. (Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* i. 259.) Professor Plumptre ingeniously illustrates this fact by a reference to Luke vii. 24 (*Dict. of Bibl.*, s. v. "Scribes").

[2] In the Apocryphal Gospels there is a notion that Judas had once been a demoniac, whom Jesus, as a boy, had healed (Ev. Inf. Arab. c. xxxv.; Hofmann, *Leben Jesu nach d. Apokr.* 202). For the legendary notion of his aspect, see the story of St. Brandan, so exquisitely told by Mr. Matthew Arnold: —

> "At last (it was the Christmas night;
> Stars shone after a day of storm)
> He sees float by an iceberg white,
> And on it — Christ! — a living form!
>
> That furtive mien, that scowling eye,
> Of hair that red and tufted fell;
> It is — oh, where shall Brandan fly? —
> The traitor Judas, out of hell."

[3] Perhaps more (Luke viii. 3, ἕτεραι πολλαί). It is curious that no mention is made of the wife of Peter or of the other married Apostles (1 Cor. ix. 5). Of Susanna here mentioned by St. Luke, absolutely nothing further is known. Mary, the mother of James the Less, was another of these ministering women; and it is an illustration of the extreme paucity of names among the Jews, and the confusion that results from it, that there are perhaps as many as seven Marys in the Gospel History alone. (See a fragment attributed to Papias in Routh, *Relig. Sacr.* i. 16; Wordsworth on Matt. xii. 47; Ewald, *Gesch. Christus*, p. 401, 3d edit.) The fact that they were ministering to Him of their substance shows, among other circumstances, that there was no absolute community of goods in the little band.

whom, though they are partly veiled, there are some who recognize the once wealthy and dissolute but now repentant Mary of Magdala; and Salome, the wife of the fisherman Zabdîa; and one of still higher wealth and position, Joanna, the wife of Chuza, steward of Herod Antipas.[1]

But he whom all eyes seek is in the very centre of the throng; and though at His right is Peter of Bethsaida, and at His left the more youthful figure of John, yet every glance is absorbed by Him alone.

He is not clothed in soft raiment of byssus or purple, like Herod's courtiers, or the luxurious friends of the Procurator Pilate: He does not wear the white ephod of the Levite, or the sweeping robes of the Scribe. There are not, on His arm and forehead, the *tephillîn* or phylacteries,[2] which the Pharisees make so broad; and though there is at each corner of His dress the fringe and blue ribbon which the Law enjoins, it is not worn of the ostentatious size affected by those who wished to parade the scrupulousness of their obedience. He is in the ordinary dress of His time and country. He is not bareheaded — as painters usually represent Him — for to move about bareheaded in the Syrian sunlight is impossible,[3] but a white *keffiyeh*, such as is worn to this day, covers his hair, fastened by an *aghal*, or fillet, round the top of the head, and falling back over the neck and shoulders. A large blue outer robe or *tallîth*, pure and clean, but of the simplest materials,

[1] The Blessed Virgin was not one of this ministering company. The reason for her absence from it is not given. It is not impossible that a certain amount of constraint was put upon her by the "brethren of the Lord," who on three distinct occasions (Matt. xii. 46; Mark iii. 21; John vii. 3: see pp. 217, 249) interfered with Jesus, and on one of those occasions seem to have worked upon the susceptibilities even of His mother. Meanwhile her absence from Christ's journeyings is an incidental proof of the deep seclusion in which she evidently lived — a seclusion sufficiently indicated by the silence of the Gospels respecting her, and which accords most accurately with the incidental notices of her humble and meditative character.

[2] We cannot believe that Christ sanctioned by His own practice — at any rate, in manhood — the idle and superstitious custom of wearing those little text-boxes, which had in all probability originated merely in an unintelligent and slavishly literal interpretation of a metaphorical command. For further information about the *tephillîn*, I may refer the reader to my article on "Frontlets" in Dr. Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, or to the still fuller article by Dr. Ginsburg in Kitto's *Bibl. Cyclop.* s. v. "Phylacteries."

[3] This must surely have occurred to every one after a moment's reflection, yet, strange to say, I cannot recall one of the great works of mediæval art in which the Saviour is depicted with covered head. The ordinary articles of dress now are the *kumis*, or inner shirt; *gumbâr*, or *kaftan*, open gown of silk or cotton, overlapping in front; *zannar*, or girdle; *abba*, or *abaiyeh*, a strong, coarse cloak, in which the wearer usually sleeps; and *tarbush*, or fez. (See Thomson, *Land and Book*, I., ch. ix.)

covers His entire person, and only shows occasional glimpses of the *ketôneth,* a seamless woollen tunic of the ordinary striped texture, so common in the East, which is confined by a girdle round the waist, and which clothes Him from the neck almost down to the sandalled feet. But the simple garments do not conceal the King; and though in His bearing there is nothing of the self-conscious haughtiness of the Rabbi, yet, in its natural nobleness and unsought grace, it is such as instantly suffices to check every rude tongue and overawe every wicked thought.

And his aspect?[1] He is a man of middle size, and of about thirty years of age, on whose face the purity and charm of youth are mingled with the thoughtfulness and dignity of manhood. His hair, which legend has compared to the color of wine, is parted in the middle of the forehead, and flows down over the neck. His features are paler and of a more Hellenic type than the weather-bronzed and olive-tinted faces of the hardy fishermen who are His Apostles; but though those features have evidently been marred by sorrow — though it is manifest that those eyes, whose pure and indescribable glance seems to read the very secrets of the heart, have often glowed through tears — yet no man, whose soul has not been eaten away by sin and selfishness, can look unmoved and unawed on the divine expression of that calm and patient face. Yes, this is He of whom Moses and the Prophets did speak — Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary, and the Son of David; and the Son of Man, and the Son of God. Our eyes have seen the King in His beauty. We have beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. And having seen Him we can well understand how, while He spake, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice and said, "Blessed is the womb that bare Thee, and the paps that Thou hast sucked!" "Yea, rather blessed," He answered, in words full of deep sweet mystery, "are they that hear the word of God and keep it."

One or two facts and features of His life on earth may here be fitly introduced.

1. First, then, it was a life of *poverty.* Some of the old Messianic prophecies, which the Jews in general so little understood, had already indicated His voluntary submission

[1] See Excursus VI., "On the Traditional Descriptions of the Appearance of Jesus."

to a humble lot.[1] "Though He were rich, yet for our sakes He became poor." He was born in the cavern-stable, cradled in the manger. His mother offered for her purification the doves which were the offering of the poor. The flight into Egypt was doubtless accompanied with many a hardship, and when He returned it was to live as a carpenter, and the son of a carpenter, in the despised provincial village. It was as a poor wandering teacher, possessing nothing, that He travelled through the land. With the words, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," He began His Sermon on the Mount; and He made it the chief sign of the opening dispensation that to the poor the Gospel was being preached. It was a fit comment on this His poverty, that after but three short years of His public ministry He was sold by one of His own Apostles for the thirty shekels which were the price of the meanest slave.

2. And the *simplicity* of His life corresponded to its external poverty. Never in His life did He possess a roof which He could call His own. The humble abode at Nazareth was but shared with numerous brothers and sisters. Even the house in Capernaum which He so often visited was not His own possession; it was lent Him by one of His disciples. There never belonged to Him one foot's-breadth of the earth which He came to save. We never hear that any of the beggars, who in every Eastern country are so numerous and so importunate, asked Him for alms. Had they done so He might have answered with Peter, "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have that give I thee." His food was of the plainest. He was ready indeed, when invited, to join in the innocent social happiness of Simon's, or Levi's, or Martha's, or the bridegroom of Cana's feast; but His ordinary food was as simple as that of the humblest peasant — bread of the coarsest quality,[2] fish caught in the lake and

[1] It seems impossible to trace the date or origin of the later Jewish conception of a suffering Messias, the descendant of Joseph or Ephraim, which is found in *Zohar*, Bab. Targ. Cant. iv. 5, etc. It is clear that the nation had not realized the point of view which was familiar to the Apostles after Pentecost (see Acts iii. 18; xvii. 3; xxvi. 22, 23), and which Jesus had so often taught them (Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 10–12; Luke xvii. 25; xxiv. 25–27, 46) to regard as the fulfilment of olden prophecy (Ps. xxii.; Isa. l. 6; liii. 2, etc.).

[2] So we infer from the "barley loaves" of John vi. 9. Barley bread was so little palatable that it was given by way of punishment to soldiers who had incurred disgrace. ["Cohortes si quae cessissent, decimatas hordeo pavit" (Sueton. *Aug.* 24). "Cohortibus quae signa dimiserant hordeum dari jussit" (Liv. xxvii. 13).] That the Jews had a similar feeling appears from an anecdote in *Pesachim*, fol. 3, 2. Johanan said, "There is an

broiled in embers on the shore, and sometimes a piece of honeycomb, probably of the wild honey which was then found abundantly in Palestine. Small indeed was the gossamer thread of semblance on which His enemies could support the weight of their outrageous calumny, "Behold a glutton and a wine-bibber." And yet Jesus, though poor, was not a pauper. He did not for one moment countenance (as Sakya Mouni did) the life of beggary, or say one word which could be perverted into a recommendation of that degrading squalor which some religious teachers have represented as the perfection of piety. He never received an alms from the *tamchui* or *kuppa*, but He and the little company of His followers lived on their lawful possessions or the produce of their own industry, and even had a bag[1] or cash-box of their own, both for their own use and for their charities to others. From this they provided the simple necessaries of the Paschal feast, and distributed what they could to the poor; only Christ does not Himself seem to have given money to the poor, because He gave them richer and nobler gifts than could be even compared with gold or silver. Yet even the little money which they wanted was not always forthcoming, and when the collectors of the trivial sum demanded from the very poorest for the service of the Temple, came to Peter, for the didrachma which was alone required, neither he nor his Master had the sum at hand.[2] The Son of Man had no earthly possession besides the clothes He wore.

3. And it was, as we have seen, a life of *toil* — of toil from boyhood upwards, in the shop of the carpenter, to aid in maintaining Himself and His family by honest and noble labor; of toil afterwards to save the world. We have seen that "He went about doing good," and that this, which is the epitome of His public life, constitutes also its sublimest originality. The insight which we have gained already, and shall gain still further, into the manner in which His days

excellent barley harvest." They answered, "*Tell that to horses and asses.*" (See Kuinoel on John vi. 9.)

[1] γλωσσόκομον (John xii. 6), properly a little box in which flute-players kept the *tongues* or reeds of their flutes, ἐν ᾧ οἱ αὐληταὶ ἀπετίθεσαν τὰς γλωττίδας (Hesych.). Perhaps, as Mr. Monro suggests to me, a box may have been so called from the resemblance in *shape* to a reed mouthpiece, of which the essential point is an elastic valve which will open inwards. It seems unlikely that γλωσσόκομος should have the same meaning as γλωσσοκομεῖον. In the LXX. (2 Chron. xxiv. 8) it is used for the corban-box; and by Aquila (Exod. xxxvii. 1) for the Ark.

[2] Matt. xvii. 24–27.

were spent, shows us how overwhelming an amount of ever-active benevolence was crowded into the brief compass of the hours of light. At any moment He was at the service of any call, whether it came from an inquirer who longed to be taught, or from a sufferer who had faith to be healed. Teaching, preaching, travelling, doing works of mercy, bearing patiently with the fretful impatience of the stiffnecked and the ignorant, enduring without a murmur the incessant and selfish pressure of the multitude — work like this so absorbed His time and energy that we are told, more than once, that so many were coming and going as to leave no leisure even to eat. For Himself He seemed to claim no rest except the quiet hours of night and silence, when He retired so often to pray to His Heavenly Father, amid the mountain solitudes which He loved so well.

4. And it was a life of *health*. Among its many sorrows and trials, sickness alone was absent. We hear of His healing multitudes of the sick — we never hear that He was sick Himself. It is true that "the golden Passional of the Book of Isaiah" says of Him: "Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed;" but the best explanation of that passage has been already supplied from St. Matthew, that He suffered with those whom He saw suffer.[1] He was touched with a feeling of our infirmities; His divine sympathy made those sufferings His own. Certain it is that the story of His life and death shows exceptional powers of physical endurance. No one who was not endowed with perfect health could have stood out against the incessant and wearing demands of such daily life as the Gospels describe. Above all, He seems to have possessed that blessing of ready sleep which is the best natural antidote to fatigue, and the best influence to calm the over-wearied mind, and "knit up the ravelled sleeve of care." Even on the wave-lashed deck of the little fishing-boat as it was tossed on the stormy sea, He could sleep, with no better bed or pillow than the hard leather-covered boss that served as the steersman's cushion.[2] And often in those nights spent under the starry

[1] Matt. viii. 17.

[2] As usual, we owe this graphic touch, so evidently derived from an eye-witness, to the narrative of St. Mark (iv. 38).

sky, in the wilderness, and on the mountain-top, He can have had no softer resting-place than the grassy turf, no other covering than the *tallîth*, or perhaps some striped *abba*, such as often forms the sole bed of the Arab at the present day. And we shall see in the last sad scene how the same strength of constitution and endurance, even after all that He had undergone, enabled Him to hold out — after a sleepless night and a most exhausting day — under fifteen hours of trial and torture and the long-protracted agony of a bitter death.

5. And, once more, it must have been a life of *sorrow*; for He is rightly called the "Man of Sorrows." And yet we think that there is a possibility of error here. The terms "sorrow" and "joy" are very relative, and we may be sure that if there was crushing sorrow — the sorrow of sympathy with those who suffered,[1] the sorrow of rejection by those whom He loved, the sorrow of being hated by those whom He came to save, the sorrows of One on whom were laid the iniquities of the world, the sorrows of the last long agony upon the cross, when it seemed as if even His Father had forsaken Him — yet assuredly also there was an abounding joy. For the worst of all sorrows, the most maddening of all miseries — which is the consciousness of alienation from God, the sense of shame and guilt and inward degradation, the frenzy of self-loathing by which, as by a scourge of fire, the abandoned soul is driven to an incurable despair — *that* was absent, not only in its extreme forms, but even in the faintest of its most transient assoilments; and, on the other hand, the joy of an unsullied conscience, the joy of a stainless life, the joy of a soul absolutely and infinitely removed from every shadow of baseness and every fleck of guilt, the joy of an existence wholly devoted to the service of God and the love of man — *this* was ever present to Him in its fullest influences. It is hardly what the world calls joy; it was not the merriment of the frivolous, like the transient flickering of April sunshine upon the shallow stream; it was not the laughter of fools, which is as the crackling of thorns under a pot — of *this* kind of joy, life has but little for a man who feels all that life truly means. But, as is said by the great Latin Father, "*Crede mihi res severa est verum gaudium*," and of

[1] σπλαγχνίζομαι (Matt. ix. 36; xiv. 14; xv. 32; xx. 34; Mark i. 41; Luke vii. 13), συλλυπούμενος (Mark iii. 5), ἐστέναξεν (vii. 34), ἐνεβριμησατο τῷ πνεύματι (John xi. 33), ἐδάκρυσεν (ver. 35), ἔκλαυσεν (Luke xix. 41).

that deep well-spring of life which lies in the heart of things noble, and pure, and permanent, and true, even the Man of Sorrows could drink large draughts. And though we are never told that He laughed, while we are told that once He wept, and that once He sighed, and that more than once He was troubled; yet He who threw no shadow of discountenance on social meetings and innocent festivity, could not have been without that inward happiness which sometimes shone even upon His countenance, and which we often trace in the tender and almost playful irony of His words.[1] "In that hour," we are told of one occasion in His life, "Jesus rejoiced" — or, as it should rather be, exulted — "in spirit."[2] Can we believe that this rejoicing took place once alone?

[1] *If* we could attach any importance to the strange story quoted by Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* v. 33, 3) as having been derived by Papias from hearers of St. John, we should only see in it a marked instance of this playful and imaginative manner in speaking at unconstrained moments to the simplest and truest-hearted of His followers. The words, which have evidently been reflected and refracted by the various media through which they have reached us, may have been uttered in a sort of divine irony, as though they were a playful description of Messianic blessings to be fulfilled, not in the hard Judaic sense, but in a truer and more spiritual sense. "The Lord taught, The days will come in which vines shall spring up, each having ten thousand stems, and on each stem ten thousand branches, and on each branch ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand clusters, and on each cluster ten thousand grapes, and each grape, when pressed, shall give twenty-five measures of wine. And when any saint shall have seized one cluster, another shall cry, 'I am a better cluster; take me, through me bless the Lord'" (Westcott, *Introd.*, p. 433). Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 39) speaks of Papias as a weak-minded man; and this passage is more like a Talmudic or Mohammedan legend than a genuine reminiscence (see Hofmann, *Leben Jesu*, p. 324); yet it perhaps admits of the explanation I have given. The book of Papias was called λόγων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις, and another fragment of it on Judas Iscariot shows his credulity. (Neander, *Ch. Hist.*, E. Tr., ii. 430.)

[2] Luke x. 21, ἠγαλλιάσατο.

CHAPTER XXIII.

A GREAT DAY IN THE LIFE OF JESUS.

"My mystery is for me, and for the sons of my house." — *Saying attributed to Jesus in* CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* v. 10, 64.

THE sequence of events in the narrative on which we are now about to enter is nearly the same in the first three Gospels. Without neglecting any clear indications given by the other Evangelists, we shall, in this part of the life of Jesus, mainly follow the chronological guidance of St. Luke. The order of St. Matthew and St. Mark appears to be much guided by subjective considerations.[1] Events in their Gospels are sometimes grouped together by their moral or religious bearings. St. Luke, as is evident, pays more attention to the natural sequence, although he also occasionally allows a unity of subject to supersede in his arrangement the order of time.[2]

Immediately after the missionary journey which we have described, St. Luke adds that when Jesus saw Himself surrounded by a great multitude out of every city, He spake by a parable.[3] We learn from the two other Evangelists the interesting circumstance that this was the first occasion on which He taught in parables, and that they were spoken to the multitude who lined the shore while our Lord sat in His favorite pulpit, the boat which was kept for Him on the Lake.[4]

We might infer from St. Mark that this teaching was de-

[1] Papias, on the authority of John the Elder, distinctly says that St. Mark did not write chronologically (*οὐ μέντοι τάξει*) the deeds and words of Christ (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39).

[2] To make the *καθεξῆς* of Luke i. 3 mean "in strictly accurate sequence," is to press it overduly. The word, which is peculiar to St. Luke, is used quite vaguely in chap. viii. 1; Acts iii. 24; xi. 4.

[3] Luke viii. 4. The expression of St. Matthew (xiii. 1), "the same day," or as it should be rather, "on that day," looks more definite; but the events that follow could not have taken place on the same day as those narrated in his previous chapter (much of which probably refers to a later period altogether), and the same phrase is used quite indefinitely in Acts viii. 1.

[4] Matt. xiii. 2, *εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἐμβάντα*.

livered on the afternoon of the day on which He healed the paralytic, but the inference is too precarious to be relied on.[1] All that we can see is that this new form of teaching was felt to be necessary in consequence of the state of mind which had been produced in some at least of the hearers among the multitude. The one emphatic word "hearken!" with which He prefaced His address prepared them for something unusual and memorable in what He was going to say.[2]

The great mass of hearers must now have been aware of the general features in the new Gospel which Jesus preached. Some self-examination, some earnest careful thought of their own was now requisite, if they were indeed sincere in their desire to profit by His words. "Take heed how ye hear" was the great lesson which He would now impress. He would warn them against the otiose attention of curiosity or mere intellectual interest, and would fix upon their minds a sense of their moral responsibility for the effects produced by what they heard. He would teach them in such a way that the extent of each hearer's profit should depend largely upon his own faithfulness.

And, therefore, to show them that the only true fruit of good teaching is holiness of life, and that there were many dangers which might prevent its growth, He told them His first parable, the Parable of the Sower. The imagery of it was derived, as usual, from the objects immediately before His eyes — the sown fields of Gennesareth; the springing corn in them; the hard-trodden paths which ran through them, on which no corn could grow; the innumerable birds which fluttered over them ready to feed upon the grain; the weak and withering struggle for life on the stony places; the tangling growth of luxuriant thistles in neglected corners; the deep loam of the general soil, on which already the golden ears stood thick and strong, giving promise of a sixty- and hundred-fold return as they rippled under the balmy wind.[3] To us, who from infancy have read the parable side by side with Christ's own interpretation of it, the meaning is singularly clear and plain, and we see in it the liveliest images of the danger incurred by the cold and indifferent, by the impulsive and shallow, by the worldly and ambitious, by the preoccupied and the luxurious, as they listen to the Word of God. But it was not so easy to those

[1] Compare Mark ii. 13; iv. 1. [2] Mark iv. 3.
[3] See Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.*, p. 496.

who heard it.[1] Even the disciples failed to catch its full significance, although they reserved their request for an explanation till they and their Master should be alone. It is clear that parables like this, so luminous to us, but so difficult to these simple listeners, suggested thoughts which to them were wholly unfamiliar.[2]

It seems clear that our Lord did not on this occasion deliver all of those seven parables — the parable of the tares of the field, of the grain of mustard-seed, of the leaven, of the hid treasure, of the pearl, and of the net — which, from a certain resemblance in their subjects and consecutiveness in their teaching, are here grouped together by St. Matthew.[3] Seven parables [4] delivered at once, and delivered without interpretation, to a promiscuous multitude which He was for the first time addressing in this form of teaching, would have only tended to bewilder and to distract. Indeed, the expression of St. Mark — "as they were able to hear it" [5] — seems distinctly to imply a gradual and non-continuous course of teaching, which would have lost its value if it had given to listeners more than they were able to remember and to understand. We may rather conclude, from a comparison of St. Mark and St. Luke, that the teaching of this particular afternoon contained no other parables, except perhaps the simple and closely analogous ones of the grain of mustard-seed, and of the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear, which might serve to encourage into patience those who were expecting too rapid a revelation of the kingdom of God in their own lives and in the world; and perhaps, with these, the similitude of the candle to warn them not to stifle the light they had received, but to remember that Great Light which should one day reveal all things, and so to let their light shine as to illuminate both their own paths in life, and to shed radiance on the souls of all around.

[1] It is a part of the divine boldness of Christ's teaching, and the manner in which it transcends in its splendid paradox all ordinary modes of expression, that in His explanation of the parable, the seed when once sown is *identified with* him who receives it (Mark iv. 16; Matt. xiii. 20, ὁ ἐπὶ μετρώδη σπαρείς, "*he* that was sown on stony places" [unfortunately rendered in our version, "he that *received the seed* into," etc.]). See Lightfoot *On Revision*, p. 48.

[2] Matt. xiii. 1–23; Mark iv. 1–25; Luke viii. 4–18.

[3] For the scene of their delivery at least changes in Matt. xiii. 34–36.

[4] Matt. xiii. 24–30; Mark iv. 26–34; Luke xiii. 18–21. *Eight*, if we add Mark iv. 26–29. They illustrate the various reception (the Sower); the mingled results (the tares and the net); the priceless value (the treasure and the pearl); and the slow gradual extension (the mustard-seed, the leaven, the springing corn) of the Gospel of the kingdom.

[5] Mark iv. 33.

A method of instruction so rare, so stimulating, so full of interest — a method which, in its unapproachable beauty and finish, stands unrivalled in the annals of human speech — would doubtless tend to increase beyond measure the crowds that thronged to listen. And through the sultry afternoon He continued to teach them, barely succeeding in dismissing them when the evening was come.[1] A sense of complete weariness and deep unspeakable longing for repose, and solitude, and sleep, seems then to have come over our Lord's spirit. Possibly the desire for rest and quiet may have been accelerated by one more ill-judged endeavor of His mother and His brethren to assert a claim upon His actions.[2] They had not indeed been able "to come at Him for the press," but their attempt to do so may have been one more reason for a desire to get away, and be free for a time from this incessant publicity, from these irreverent interferences. At any rate, one little touch, preserved for us as usual by the graphic pen of the Evangelist St. Mark, shows that there was a certain eagerness and urgency in His departure, as though in His weariness, and in that oppression of mind which results from the wearing contact with numbers, He could not return to Capernaum, but suddenly determined on a change of plan. After dismissing the crowd, the disciples took Him, "*as He was*," [3] in the boat, no time being left, in the urgency of His spirit, for preparation of any kind. He yearned for the quiet and deserted loneliness of the eastern shore. The western shore also is lonely now, and the traveller will meet no human being there but a few careworn Fellahîn, or a Jew from Tiberias, or some Arab fishermen, or an armed and mounted Skeykh of some tribe of Bedawîn. But the eastern shore is loneliness itself; not a tree, not a village, not a human being, not a single habitation is visible; nothing but the low range of hills, scarred with rocky fissures, and sweeping down to a narrow

[1] Mark iv. 35. If our order of events be correct, these incidents took place in the early part of March, at which time the weather in Palestine is often intensely hot. I never suffered more from heat than on one April day on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, when it was with difficulty that I could keep my seat on horseback.

[2] Luke viii. 19–21. This cannot be the same incident as that narrated in Matt. xii. 46–50; Mark iii. 31–35 (*v.* p. 217), as is shown by the context of those passages. It is, however, exactly the kind of circumstance, calling forth the same remark, which might naturally happen more than once; and although a supposition of perpetually recurring similarities is only the uncritical resource of despairing harmonists, it may perhaps be admissible here.

[3] Mark iv. 36.

and barren strip which forms the margin of the Lake. In our Lord's time the contrast of this thinly inhabited region with the busy and populous towns that lay close together on the Plain of Gennesareth must have been very striking; and though the scattered population of Peræa was partly Gentile, we shall find Him not unfrequently seeking to recover the tone and calm of His burdened soul by putting those six miles of water between Himself and the crowds He taught.

But before the boat could be pushed off, another remarkable interruption occurred. Three of His listeners in succession [1] — struck perhaps by the depth and power of this His new method of teaching, dazzled too by this zenith of His popularity — desired or fancied that they desired to attach themselves to Him as permanent disciples. The first was a Scribe, who, thinking no doubt that his official rank would make him a most acceptable disciple, exclaimed with confident asseveration, "Lord, I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest." But in spite of the man's high position, in spite of his glowing promises, He who cared less than nothing for lip-service, and who preferred "the modesty of fearful duty" to the "rattling tongue of audacious eloquence," coldly checked His would-be follower. He who had called the hated publican gave no encouragement to the reputable Scribe. He did not reject the proffered service, but neither did He accept it. Perhaps "in the man's flaring enthusiasm, He saw the smoke of egotistical self-deceit." He pointed out that His service was not one of wealth, or honor, or delight; not one in which any could hope for earthly gain. "The foxes," He said, "have holes, and the birds of the air have resting-places,[2] but the Son of Man [3] hath not where to lay His head."

The second was already a partial disciple,[4] but wished to become an entire follower, with the reservation that he might first be permitted to bury his father. "Follow me!" was the thrilling answer, "and let the dead bury their dead;" that is, leave the world and the things of the world to mind themselves. He who would follow Christ must in compari-

[1] Matt. viii. 19–22; Luke ix. 57–62. The position of the incident in the narrative of St. Matthew seems to show that it has been narrated out of its order, and more *generally* (*ποφευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*), by St. Luke.

[2] *κατασκηνώσεις*, rather "shelters" than "nests;" for birds do not live in nests.

[3] This was a title which would kindle no violent antipathy, and yet was understood to be Messianic. Cf. Dan. vii. 13; John xii. 34. (See p. 131.)

[4] An ancient but otherwise groundless tradition says that it was Philip (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 4, § 25).

son hate even father and mother. He must leave the spiritually dead to attend to their physically dead.[1]

The answer to the third aspirant was not dissimilar. He too pleaded for delay — wished not to join Christ immediately in His voyage, but first of all to bid farewell to his friends at home. "No man," was the reply — which has become proverbial for all time — "No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit[2] for the kingdom of heaven." To use the fine image of St. Augustine, "the East was calling him, he must turn his thoughts from the fading West." It was in this spirit that the loving souls of St. Thomas of Aquino, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Francis Xavier, and so many more of the great saints in the Church's history consoled and fortified themselves, when forced to resign every family affection, and for Christ's sake to abandon every earthly tie.

So, then, at last these fresh delays were over, and the little vessel could spread her sails for the voyage. Yet even now Jesus was, as it were, pursued by followers, for, as St. Mark again tells us, "other little ships were with Him." But they, in all probability — since we are not told of their reaching the other shore — were soon scattered or frightened back by the signs of a gathering storm. At any rate, in His own boat, and among His own trusted disciples, Jesus could rest undisturbed, and long before they were far from shore, had laid His weary head on the leather cushion of the steersman, and was sleeping the deep sleep of the worn and weary — the calm sleep of those who are at peace with God.

Even that sleep, so sorely needed, was destined to speedy and violent disturbance. One of the fierce storms peculiar to that deep hollow in the earth's surface, swept down with

[1] Some have seen a certain difficulty and harshness in this answer. Theophylact and many others interpret it to mean that the disciple asked leave to live at home till his father's death. Such an offer of personal attendance would seem to be too vague to be of any value; on the other hand, Sepp and others have argued that had his father been really dead he would have been regarded as ceremonially unclean, and could hardly have been present at all. In either case, however, the general lesson is that drawn by St. Augustine: "*Amandus est generator, sed praeponendus est creator.*" If it was a mere question of personal attendance on a funeral, that was of little importance compared to the great work for which he offered himself: if it was more than this, might not the indefinite delay breed a subsequent remorse — possibly even a subsequent apostasy?

[2] εὔθετος (Luke ix. 62, literally, "well-adapted." Possibly both the aspirant and our Lord referred mentally to the story of Elisha's call (1 Kings xix. 19, 20). The parallel in Hesiod, *Opp.* ii. 60 — *ἰθείην ἀῦλακ' ἐλαύνοι Μηκίτι παπταίνων μηδ' ὁμήλικας* — is extremely striking. Yet who would be so absurd as to dream of plagiarism here?

sudden fury on the little inland sea. With scarcely a moment's notice,[1] the air was filled with whirlwind and the sea buffeted into tempest. The danger was extreme. The boat was again and again buried amid the foam of the breakers which burst over it; yet though they must have covered Him with their dashing spray as He lay on the open deck at the stern, He was calmly sleeping on[2] — undisturbed, so deep was His fatigue, by the tempestuous darkness — and as yet no one ventured to awake Him. But now the billows were actually breaking into the boat itself, which was beginning to be filled and to sink. Then, with sudden and vehement cries of excitement and terror, the disciples woke Him. "Lord! Master! Master! save! we perish!"[3] Such were the wild sounds which, mingled with the howling of the winds and the dash of the mastering waves, broke confusedly upon His half-awakened ear. It is such crises as these — crises of sudden unexpected terror, met without a moment of preparation, which test a man, what spirit he is of — which show not only his nerve, but the grandeur and purity of his whole nature. The hurricane which shook the tried courage and baffled the utmost skill of the hardy fishermen, did not ruffle for one instant the deep inward serenity of the Son of Man. Without one sign of confusion, without one tremor of alarm, Jesus simply raised Himself on His elbow from the dripping stern of the laboring and half-sinking vessel, and, without further movement,[4] stilled the tempest of their souls by the quiet words, "Why so cowardly, O ye of little faith?" And then rising up, standing in all

[1] Travellers have often noticed, and been endangered by, these sudden storms. All that I had an opportunity of observing was the almost instantaneous change by which a smiling glassy surface was swept into a dark and threatening ripple. The expressions used by the Evangelists all imply the extreme fury of the hurricane (*σεισμὸς μέγας*, Matt. viii. 24; *κατέβη λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου*, Luke viii. 23). The heated tropical air of the Ghôr, which is so low that the surface of the Sea of Galilee lies 600 feet beneath the level of the Mediterranean, is suddenly filled by the cold and heavy winds sweeping down the snowy ranges of Lebanon and Hermon, and rushing with unwonted fury through the ravines of the Peræan hills, which converge to the head of the Lake, and act like gigantic funnels. (Thomson, *Land and Book*, II. xxv.)

[2] There is a touch of tragic surprise in the *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδε* of Matt. viii. 24. The Evangelists evidently derive their narrative from eye-witnesses. St. Matthew mentions the *ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων* (viii. 24); St. Mark, *τὰ δὲ κύματα ἐπέβαλλεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον* (iv. 37), and the *προσκεφάλαιον* (ver. 38). On this, see Smith, *Voy. of St. Paul*, p. 243.

[3] *Κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλίμεθα* (Matt. viii. 25), om. *ἡμᾶς*. *Ἐπιστάτα, ἐπιστάτα ἀπολλύμεθα* (Luke viii. 24).

[4] This seems to be clearly involved in the *τότε ἐγερθεὶς* of Matt. viii. 26 — *after* He had spoken to those who awoke Him.

the calm of a natural majesty on the lofty stern, while the hurricane tossed, for a moment only, His fluttering garments and streaming hair, He gazed forth into the darkness, and His voice was heard amid the roaring of the troubled elements, saying, "Peace! be still!"[1] And instantly the wind dropped, and there was a great calm. And as they watched the starlight reflected on the now unrippled water, not the disciples only but even the sailors[2] whispered to one another, "What manner of man is this?"

This is a stupendous miracle, one of those which test whether we indeed believe in the credibility of the miraculous or not; one of those miracles of power which cannot, like many of the miracles of healing, be explained away by existing laws. It is not my object in this book to convince the unbeliever, or hold controversy with the doubter. Something of what I had to say on this subject I have done my little best to say elsewhere;[3] and yet, perhaps, a few words may here be pardoned. Some, and they neither irreverent nor unfaithful men, have asked whether the reality may not have been somewhat different? whether we may not understand this narrative in a sense like that in which we *should* understand it if we found it in the reasonably attested legend of some mediæval saint — a St. Nicholas or a St. Brandan? whether we may not suppose that the fact which underlies the narrative was in reality not a miraculous exercise of power over those elements which are most beyond the reach of man, but that Christ's calm communicated itself by immediate and subtle influence to His terrified companions, and that the hurricane, from natural causes, sank as rapidly as it had arisen? I reply, that if this were the only miracle in the life of Christ; if the Gospels were indeed the loose, exaggerated, inaccurate, credulous narratives which such an interpretation would suppose; if there were something antecedently incredible in the supernatural; if there were in

[1] There is an almost untranslatable energy in the Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο of Mark iv. 39, and the perfect imperative implies the command that the result should be instantaneous (φιμόω — literally, "I muzzle," 1 Cor. ix. 9).

[2] Matt. viii. 27, οἱ ἄνθρωποι.

[3] *The Witness of History to Christ*, Lect. I. I refer to these Hulsean Lectures only to show that the mainly non-controversial character of the present work arises neither from any doubt in my own mind, nor from any desire to shrink from legitimate controversy. At the same time let me say distinctly that I dislike and deprecate, as wrong and as needless, the violent language used by writers on both sides of this great controversy. A man may disbelieve in miracles without being either an atheist or a blasphemer; a man may believe in them without being (as is assumed so widely) either hypocritical or weak.

the spiritual world no transcendent facts which lie far beyond the comprehension of those who would bid us see nothing in the universe but the action of material laws; if there were no providences of God during these nineteen centuries to attest the work and the divinity of Christ — then indeed there would be no difficulty in such an interpretation. But if we believe that God rules; if we believe that Christ rose; if we have reason to hold, among the deepest convictions of our being, the certainty that God has not delegated His sovereignty or His providence to the final, unintelligent, pitiless, inevitable working of material forces; if we see on every page of the Evangelists the quiet simplicity of truthful and faithful witnesses; if we see in every year of succeeding history, and in every experience of individual life, a confirmation of the testimony which they delivered — then we shall neither clutch at rationalistic interpretations, nor be much troubled if others adopt them. He who believes, he who *knows*, the efficacy of prayer, in what other men may regard as the inevitable certainties or blindly directed accidents of life — he who has felt how the voice of a Saviour, heard across the long generations, can calm wilder storms than ever buffeted into fury the bosom of the inland Lake — he who sees in the person of his Redeemer a fact more stupendous and more majestic than all those observed sequences which men endow with an imaginary omnipotence, and worship under the name of Law — to him, at least, there will be neither difficulty nor hesitation in supposing that Christ, on board that half-wrecked fishing-boat, did utter His mandate, and that the wind and the sea obeyed; that HIS WORD was indeed more potent among the cosmic forces than miles of agitated water, or leagues of rushing air.

Not even on the farther shore was Jesus to find peace or rest.[1] On the contrary, no sooner had He reached that part

[1] Matt. viii. 28–34; Mark v. 1–19; Luke viii. 26–39. The MSS. of all three Evangelists vary between Gadara, Gerasa, and Gergesa. Tischendorf, mainly relying on the Cod. Sinaiticus, reads Γεργεσηνῶν in Luke viii. 26; Γερασηνῶν in Mark v. 1; and Γαδαρηνῶν in Matt. viii. 28. After the researches of Dr. Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, II., ch. xxv.), there can be no doubt that Gergesa — though mentioned only by St. Luke — was the name of a little town nearly opposite Capernaum, the ruined site of which is still called Kerza or Gersa by the Bedawin. The existence of this little town was apparently known both to Origen, who first introduced the reading, and to Eusebius and Jerome; and in their day a steep declivity near it, where the hills approach to within a little distance from the Lake, was pointed out as the scene of the miracle. Gerasa is much too far to the east, being almost in Arabia. Gadara — if that reading be correct in Matt.

of Peræa which is called by St. Matthew the "country of the Gergesenes," than He was met by an exhibition of human fury, and madness, and degradation, even more terrible and startling than the rage of the troubled sea. Barely had He landed when, from among the rocky cavern-tombs of the Wady Semak, there burst into His presence a man troubled with the most exaggerated form of that raging madness which was universally attributed to demoniacal possession. Amid all the boasted civilization of antiquity, there existed no hospitals, no penitentiaries, no asylums; and unfortunates of this class, being too dangerous and desperate for human intercourse, could only be driven forth from among their fellow-men, and restrained from mischief by measures at once inadequate and cruel. Under such circumstances they could, if irreclaimable, only take refuge in those holes along the rocky hill-sides which abound in Palestine, and which were used by the Jews as tombs. It is clear that the foul and polluted nature of such dwelling-places, with all their associations of ghastliness and terror, would tend to aggravate the nature of the malady;[1] and this man, who had long been afflicted, was beyond even the possibility of control.[2] Attempts had been made to bind him, but in the paroxysms of his mania he had exerted that apparently supernatural strength which is often noticed in such forms of mental excitement, and had always succeeded in rending off his fetters, and twisting away or shattering his chains;[3] and

viii. 28 (ℵ, B) — can only be the name of the whole district, derived from its capital. The authority of the reading is, however, weakened (1) by the fact that it was only found in a few MSS. in Origen's time; and (2) by the probability of so well-known a place being inserted instead of the obscure little Gergesa. The ruins of Gadara are still visible at *Um Keis*, three hours to the south of the extreme end of the Lake, and on the other side of the river Jarmuk, or Hieromax, the banks of which are as deep and precipitous as those of the Jordan. It is therefore far too remote to have any real connection with the scene of the miracle; and in point of fact Γεργεσηνῶν must have been something more than a conjecture of Origen's in this verse, for it is found in eight uncials, most cursives, and (among others) in the Coptic and Æthiopic versions. It must therefore be regarded as the probable reading, and St. Matthew, as one who had actually lived on the shore of the Lake, was most likely to know its minute topography, and so to have preserved the real name.

[1] Tombs were the express dwelling-place of demons in the Jewish belief (*Nidda*, fol. 17 *a*; *Chagigah*, fol. 3, 6). "When a man spends a night in a graveyard, an evil spirit descends upon him" (Gfrörer, *Jahrh. des Heils*, i. 408). It must not be forgotten that these δαιμόνια were expressly supposed to be spirits of the wicked dead (πονηρῶν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπων πνεύματα, Jos. *B. J.* vii. 6, § 3).

[2] Compare Sir W. Scott's powerful description of the effects produced on the minds of the Covenanters by their cavern retirements.

[3] Mark v. 4, διὰ τὸ . . . διεσπᾶσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἁλύσεις καὶ τὰς πέδας

now he had been abandoned to the lonely hills and unclean solitudes which, night and day, rang with his yells as he wandered among them, dangerous to himself and to others, raving, and gashing himself with stones.

It was the frightful figure of this naked and homicidal maniac that burst upon our Lord almost as soon as He had landed at early dawn;[1] and perhaps another demoniac, who was not a Gadarene, and who was less grievously afflicted, may have hovered about at no great distance,[2] although, beyond this allusion to his presence, he plays no part in the narrative. The presence, the look, the voice of Christ, even before he addressed these sufferers, seems always to have calmed and overawed them, and this demoniac of Gergesa was no exception. Instead of falling upon the disciples, he ran to Jesus from a distance, and fell down before Him in an attitude of worship. Mingling his own perturbed individuality with that of the multitude of unclean spirits which he believed to be in possession of His soul, he entreated the Lord, in loud and terrified accents, not to torment him before the time.

It is well known that to recall a maniac's attention to his name, to awake his memory, to touch his sympathies by past association, often produces a lucid interval, and perhaps this may have been the reason why Jesus said to the man,

συντετρῖφθαι. St. Mark and St. Luke here give us the minute details, which show the impression made on the actual witnesses. St. Matthew's narrative is less circumstantial; it is probable that he was not with our Lord, and he may have been preparing for that winding-up of his affairs which was finished at the great feast prepared for Jesus apparently on the afternoon of this very day.

[1] Mark v. 2, εὐθέως ἀπήντησεν αὐτῷ; Luke viii. 27, ἱμάτιον οὐκ ἐνεδιδύσκετο. This does not necessarily mean that he was stark naked, for he may still have worn a χίτων; but the tendency to strip themselves bare of every rag of clothing is common among lunatics. It was, for instance, one of the tendencies of Christian VII. of Denmark. Furious maniacs — absolutely naked — wander to this day in the mountains, and sleep in the caves of Palestine. (Thomson, *Land and Book*, I., ch. xi.; Warburton, *The Crescent and the Cross*, ii. 352.)

[2] As we may perhaps infer from Matt. viii. 28. There is a difference here, but no fair critic dealing with any other narrative would dream of calling it an irreconcilable discrepancy; at any rate they would not consider that it in any way impaired the credibility of the narrative. Probably, if we knew the actual circumstances, we should see no shadow of difficulty in the fact that Matthew mentions two, and the other Evangelists one. Similar minute differences occur at every step in the perfectly honest evidence of men whom no one, on that account, dreams of doubting, or of charging with untrustworthy observation. Ἕτερον ἐστι, says St. Chrysostom, διαφόρως εἰπεῖν καὶ μαχομένους εἰπεῖν. "Per hujusmodi Evangelistarum locutiones," says St. Augustine, "VARIAS SED NON CONTRARIAS, discimus nihil in cujusque verbis nos inspicere debere, nisi voluntatem," etc. (Aug. *De Cons. Evang.* ii. 28.)

"What is thy name?" But this question only receives the wild answer, "My name is Legion, for we are many." The man had, as it were, lost his own name; it was absorbed in the hideous tyranny of that multitude of demons under whose influence his own personality was destroyed.[1] The presence of Roman armies in Palestine had rendered him familiar with that title of multitude, and as though six thousand evil spirits were in him he answers by the Latin word which had now become so familiar to every Jew.[2] And still agitated by his own perturbed fancies, he entreats, as though the thousands of demons were speaking by his mouth, that they might not be driven into the abyss, but be suffered to take refuge in the swine.

The narrative which follows is to us difficult of comprehension, and one which, however literally accepted, touches upon regions so wholly mysterious and unknown that we have no clew to its real significance, and can gain nothing by speculating upon it. The narrative in St. Luke runs as follows: —

"And there was an herd of many swine[3] feeding upon the mountain; and they besought Him that He would suffer them to enter into them. And He suffered them. Then went the devils out of the man, and entered into the swine; and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the lake, and were choked."

That the demoniac was healed — that in the terrible final paroxysm which usually accompanied the deliverance from this strange and awful malady, a herd of swine was in some way affected with such wild terror as to rush headlong in large numbers over a steep hill-side into the waters of the lake — and that, in the minds of all who were present, including that of the sufferer himself, this precipitate rushing of the swine was connected with the man's release from his demoniac thraldom — thus much is clear.

And indeed, so far, there is no difficulty whatever. Any one who believes in the Gospels, and believes that the Son of God *did* work on earth deeds which far surpass mere

[1] This duality and apparent interchange of consciousness were universal among this afflicted class. See Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 21, § 143, who explains Plato's notion of a language of the gods partly from the fact that demoniacs do not speak their own voice and language, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῶν ὑπεισιόντων δαιμόνων.

[2] The ancient Megiddo bore at this time the name Legio, from the Roman company stationed there. It is still called Ledjûn.

[3] St. Mark, specific as usual, says "about two thousand."

human power, must believe that among the most frequent of His cures were those of the distressing forms of mental and nervous malady which we ascribe to purely natural causes, but which the ancient Jews, like all Orientals, attributed to direct supernatural agency.[1] And knowing to how singular an extent the mental impressions of man affect by some unknown electric influence the lower animals — knowing for instance, that man's cowardice and exultation, and even his superstitious terrors, *do* communicate themselves to the dog which accompanies him, or the horse on which he rides — there can be little or no difficulty in understanding that the shrieks and gesticulations of a powerful lunatic might strike uncontrollable terror into a herd of swine. We know further that the spasm of deliverance was often attended with fearful convulsions, sometimes perhaps with an effusion of blood;[2] and we know that the sight and smell of human blood produces strange effects in many animals. May there not have have been something of this kind at work in this singular event?

It is true that the Evangelists (as their language clearly shows) held, in all its simplicity, the belief that actual devils passed in multitudes out of the man and into the swine. But is it not allowable here to make a distinction between actual facts and that which was the mere conjecture and inference of the spectators from whom the three Evangelists heard the tale? If we are not bound to believe the man's hallucination that six thousand devils were in possession of his soul, are we bound to believe the possibility, suggested by his perturbed intellect, that the unclean spirits should pass from him into the swine?[3] If indeed we could

[1] "All kinds of diseases which are called melancholy they call an evil spirit" (Maimon. in *Shabbath*, ii. 5). Hence it is not surprising that mechanical exorcisms were sometimes resorted to (Tob. viii. 2, 3; Jos. *Antt.* viii. 2, § 5; Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* 85, *χρώμενοι ἐξορκίζουσι . . . θυμιάμασι*). In *Jer. Terumoth*, fol. 40, 2 (ap. Otho. *Lex. Rabb.* s. v. "Daemones"), people afflicted with hypochondria, melancholy, and brain-disease, are all treated as demoniacs, and Kardaicus is even made a demon's name. St. Peter seems to class all the diseased whom Christ cured, as *καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου* (Acts x. 38). For full information on the whole subject Gfrörer refers to Edzard, *Avoda Zara*, ii. 311–356.

[2] Some years ago the dead body of a murdered lady was discovered in a lonely field solely by the strange movements of the animals which were half-maddened by the sight of the blood-stained corpse. The fact was undisputed: "the cows," as one of the witnesses described it, "went *blaring* about the field."

[3] This was a thoroughly Jewish belief. In *Bab. Joma*, 83 *b*, R. Samuel attributes the hydrophobia of dogs to demoniac possession (Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils.* i. 412).

be sure that Jesus directly encouraged or sanctioned in the man's mind the belief that the swine were indeed driven wild by the unclean spirits which passed objectively from the body of the Gergesene into the bodies of these dumb beasts, then we could, without hesitation, believe as a literal truth, however incomprehensible, that so it was. But this by no means follows indisputably, from what we know of the method of the Evangelists. Let all who will, hold fast to the conviction that men and beasts may be quite literally possessed of devils; only let them beware of confusing their own convictions, which are binding on themselves alone, with those absolute and eternal certainties which cannot be rejected without moral blindness by others. Let them remember that a hard and denunciative dogmatism approaches more nearly than anything else to that Pharisaic want of charity which the Lord whom they love and worship visited with his most scathing anger and rebuke. The literal reality of demoniac possession is a belief for which more may perhaps be said than is admitted by the purely physical science of the present day,[1] but it is not a necessary article of the Christian creed; and if any reader imagines that in this brief narrative, to a greater extent than in any other, there are certain *nuances* of expression in which subjective inferences are confused with exact realities, he is holding a view which has the sanction of many wise and thoughtful Churchmen, and has a right to do so without the slightest imputation on the orthodoxy of his belief.[2]

[1] See this beautifully and moderately stated by Professor Westcott (*Charact. of the Gosp. Miracles*, pp. 72–83). He contrasts the superstitious materialism of Josephus (*Antt.* viii. 2, § 5; *B. J.* vii. 6, § 3) with the simplicity of the Gospel narratives. A powerful series of arguments for the tenability of the view which denies actual demoniac possession may be found in Jahn, *Archaeologia Biblica* (to which I have already referred), and are maintained by the late Rev. J. F. Denham in Kitto's *Bibl. Cyclop.*, s. v. "Demons."

[2] So many good, able, and perfectly orthodox writers have, with the same data before them, arrived at differing conclusions on this question, that any certainty respecting it appears to be impossible. My own view under these circumstances is of no particular importance, but it is this. I have shown that the Jews, like all unscientific nations in all ages, attributed many nervous disorders and physical obstructions to demoniac possession which we should attribute to natural causes; but I am not prepared to deny that in the dark and desperate age which saw the Redeemer's advent there *may* have been forms of madness which owed their more immediate manifestation to evil powers. I should not personally find much hardship or difficulty in accepting such a belief, and have only been arguing against the uncharitable and pernicious attempt to treat it as a necessary article of faith for all. The subject is too obscure (even to science) to admit of dogmatism on either side. Since writing the above paragraphs,

That the whole scene was violent and startling appears in the fact that the keepers of the swine "fled and told it in the city and in the country." The people of Gergesa, and the Gadarenes and Gerasenes of all the neighboring district, flocked out to see the Mighty Stranger who had thus visited their coasts. What livelier or more decisive proof of His power and His beneficence could they have had than the sight which met their eyes? The filthy and frantic demoniac who had been the terror of the country, so that none could pass that way — the wild-eyed dweller in the tombs who had been accustomed to gash himself with cries of rage, and whose untamed fierceness broke away all fetters — was now calm as a child. Some charitable hand had flung an outer robe over his naked figure, and he was sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind.

"And they were afraid" — more afraid of that Holy Presence than of the previous furies of the possessed. The man indeed was saved; but what of that, considering that some of their two thousand unclean beasts had perished! Their precious swine were evidently in danger; the greed and gluttony of every apostate Jew and low-bred Gentile in the place were clearly imperilled by receiving such a one as they saw that Jesus was. With disgraceful and urgent unanimity they entreated and implored Him to leave their coasts.[1] Both heathens and Jews had recognized already the great truth that God sometimes answers bad prayers in His deepest anger.[2] Jesus Himself had taught His disciples

I find that (to say nothing of Dr. Lardner) two writers so entirely above suspicion as Neander and De Pressensé substantially hold the same view. "There is a gap here," says Neander, "in our connection of the facts. Did Christ really participate in the opinions of the demoniac, or was it only subsequently inferred from the fact that the swine rushed down, that Christ had allowed the evil spirits to take possession of them?" (*Life of Christ*, p. 207, E. Tr.) "That these devils," says Pressensé, "literally entered into the body of the swine is an inadmissible supposition" (*Jesus Christ*, p. 339, E. Tr.). The modern Jews, like their ancestors, attribute a vast number of interferences to the *schedîm*, or evil spirits. See, on the whole subject, Excursus VII., "Jewish Angelology and Demonology."

[1] Matt. viii. 34, παρεκάλεσαν; Mark v. 17, ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν; Luke viii. 37, ἠρώτησαν. The heathen character of the district comes more fully home to us when we remember that Meleager and Philodemus, two of the least pure poets of the Greek anthology, were natives of this very Gadara about B.C. 50.

[2] See Exod. x. 28, 29; Numb. xxii. 20; Ps. lxxviii. 29–31.

> "We, ignorant of ourselves,
> Beg often our own harms, which the wise powers
> Deny us for our good." — SHAKES. *Ant. and Cleop.* ii. 1.

> "God answers sharp and sudden on some prayers,
> And flings the things we have asked for in our face;
> A gauntlet with a gift in't." — *Aurora Leigh.*

not to give that which was holy to the dogs, neither to cast their pearls before swine, "lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." He had gone across the lake for quiet and rest, desiring, though among lesser multitudes, to extend to these semi-heathens also the blessings of the kingdom of God. But they loved their sins and their swine, and with a perfect energy of deliberate preference for all that was base and mean, rejected such blessings, and entreated Him to go away. Sadly, but at once, He turned and left them. Gergesa was no place for Him; better the lonely hill-tops to the north of it; better the crowded strand on the other side.

And yet He did not leave them in anger. One deed of mercy had been done there; one sinner had been saved; from one soul the unclean spirits had been cast out. And just as the united multitude of the Gadarenes had entreated for His absence, so the poor saved demoniac entreated henceforth to be with Him. But Jesus would fain leave one more, one last opportunity for those who had rejected Him. On others for whose sake miracles had been performed He had enjoined silence; on this man — since He was now leaving the place — He enjoined publicity. "Go home," He said, "to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee." And so the demoniac of Gergesa became the first great missionary to the region of Decapolis, bearing in his own person the confirmation of his words; and Jesus, as His little vessel left the inhospitable shore, might still hope that the day might not be far distant — might come, at any rate before over that ill-fated district burst the storm of sword and fire[1] — when

> "E'en the witless Gadarene,
> Preferring Christ to swine, would feel
> That life is sweetest when 'tis clean."[2]

The truth was also thoroughly recognized in Pagan literature, as in Plato, *Alcib.* ii. 138, B; Juv. *Sat.* x. 7, "Evertere domos totas *optantibus ipsis* Di faciles;" and x. 111, "Magnaque numinibus vota exaudita malignis." This is, in fact, the moral of the legend of Tithonus.

[1] For the fearful massacre and conflagration of Gadara, the capital of this district, see Jos. *B. J.* iii. 7, § 1.

[2] Coventry Patmore.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE DAY OF MATTHEW'S FEAST.

"Nunquam laeti sitis, nisi quum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate." — JEROME in Eph. v. 3 (*quoted as a saying of Christ from the Hebrew Gospel*).

THE events just described had happened apparently in the early morning, and it might perhaps be noon when Jesus reached once more the Plain of Gennesareth. People had recognized the sail of His returning vessel, and long before He reached land[1] the multitudes had lined the shore, and were waiting for Him, and received Him gladly.

If we may here accept as chronological the order of St. Matthew[2] — to whom, as we shall see hereafter, this must have been a very memorable day — Jesus went first into the town of Capernaum, which was now regarded as "His own city." He went at once to the house — probably the house of St. Peter — which He ordinarily used when staying at Capernaum. There the crowd gathered in ever denser numbers, filling the house, and even the court-yard which surrounded it, so that there was no access even to the door.[3] But there was one poor sufferer — a man bedridden from a stroke of paralysis — who, with his friends, had absolutely determined that access should be made for *him;* he would be one of those violent men who would take the kingdom of heaven by force. And the four who were carrying him, finding that they could not reach Jesus through the crowd, made their way to the roof, perhaps by the usual outer stair-

[1] Luke viii. 40.

[2] Matt. ix. 1. Some may see an objection to this arrangement in the fact that St. Luke (v. 17) mentions Pharisees not only from Galilee, but even from Judæa and Jerusalem as being present at the scene. It is, however, perfectly clear that the Pharisees are *not* the spies from Jerusalem subsequently sent to dog His steps (Mark iii. 2; vii. 1; Matt. xv. 1); for, on the contrary, St. Luke distinctly says "that the power of the Lord was present to heal them." We surmise, therefore, that they must have come from motives which were at least harmless. If, indeed, with ℵ, B, L, we read *αὐτὸν* for *αὐτοὺς, this* argument falls to the ground; but my belief in the sequence is not changed.

[3] Matt. ix. 2-8; Mark ii. 1-12; Luke v. 17-26.

case,[1] and making an aperture in the roof by the removal of a few tiles,[2] let down the paralytic, on his humble couch,[3] exactly in front of the place where Christ was sitting. The man was silent, perhaps awestruck at his manner of intrusion into the Lord's presence; but Jesus was pleased at the strength and unhesitating boldness of faith which the act displayed, and bestowing first upon the man a richer blessing than that which he primarily sought, He gently said to him, as He had said to the woman who was a sinner, "Be of good courage, son;[4] thy sins are forgiven thee." Our Lord had before observed the unfavorable impression produced on the bystanders by those startling words. He again observed it now in the interchanged glances of the Scribes who were present, and the look of angry disapproval on their countenances.[5] But on this occasion He did not, as before, silently substitute another phrase. On the contrary, He distinctly challenged attention to His words, and miraculously justified them. Reading their thoughts, He reproved them for the fierce unuttered calumnies of which their hearts were full, and put to them a direct question. "Which," He asked, "is easier? to say to the paralytic, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee;' or to say, 'Arise and walk'?"[6] May not anybody *say* the former without its being possible to tell whether the sins are forgiven or not? but who can say the latter, and give effect to his own words, without a power from above? If I can by a word heal this paralytic, is it not clear that I must be One who has also power on earth to forgive sins? The unanswerable question was received with the silence of an invincible obstinacy; but turning once more to the

[1] Eastern houses are low, and nothing is easier than to get to their roofs, especially when they are built on rising ground. For the outer staircase, see Matt. xxiv. 17.

[2] Luke v. 19, *διὰ τῶν κεράμων*. Otherwise the *ἐξορύξαντες* of St. Mark might lead us to imagine that they cut through some mud partition. Possibly they enlarged an aperture in the roof. The details are not sufficiently minute to make us understand *exactly* what was done, and the variations of reading show that some difficulty was felt by later readers; but the mere fact of opening the roof is quite an every-day matter in the East (see Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, p. 358). The objection that the lives or safety of those sitting below would be endangered (!) is one of the ignorant childishnesses of merely captious criticism.

[3] *κλινίδιον* (Luke v. 19), *κράββατον* (Mark ii. 4). Probably little more than a mere mat.

[4] Luke v. 20, *ἄνθρωπε*; Mark ii. 5, *τέκνον*. The *θάρσει, τέκνον* of Matt. ix. 2, being the tenderest, is the phrase most likely to have been used by Christ.

[5] "Why does this man speak thus? He blasphemes."—Such is probably the true meaning (א, B, D, L, etc.) of Mark ii. 7.

[6] This seems to me the most forcible punctuation in Mark ii. 9.

paralytic, Jesus said to him, "Arise, take up thy bed, and walk." At once power was restored to the palsied limbs, peace to the stricken soul. The man was healed. He rose, lifted the light couch on which he had been lying, and, while now the crowd opened a passage for him, he went to his house glorifying God; and the multitude, when they broke up to disperse, kept exchanging one with another exclamations of astonishment not unmixed with fear, "We saw strange things to-day!" "We never saw anything like this before!"

From the house — perhaps to allow of more listeners hearing His words — Jesus seems to have adjourned to His favorite shore;[1] and thence, after a brief interval of teaching, He repaired to the house of Matthew, in which the publican, who was now an Apostle, had made a great feast of farewell to all his friends.[2] As he had been a publican himself, it was natural that many of these also would be "publicans and sinners" — the outcasts of society, objects at once of hatred and contempt. Yet Jesus and His disciples, with no touch of scorn or exclusiveness, sat down with them at the feast: "for there were many, and they were his followers." A charity so liberal caused deep dissatisfaction, on two grounds, to two powerful bodies — the Pharisees and the disciples of John. To the former, mainly because this contact with men of careless and evil lives violated all the traditions of their haughty scrupulosity; to the latter, because this ready acceptance of invitations to scenes of feasting seemed to discountenance the necessity for their half-Essenian asceticism. The complaints could hardly have been made at the time, for unless any Pharisees or disciples of John merely looked in from curiosity during the progress of the meal, their own presence there would have involved them in the very blame

[1] Mark ii. 13.

[2] Matt. ix. 11; Mark ii. 15; Luke v. 29, δοχὴ μεγάλη. This shows that Matthew had made large earthly sacrifices to follow Christ. It seems quite clear that the only reason why the Synoptists relate the call of Matthew in *this* place instead of earlier, is to connect his call with this feast. But on the other hand a great farewell feast could hardly have been given on the very day of the call, and other circumstances, arising especially from the fact that the Twelve were chosen before the Sermon on the Mount, and that the call of Matthew from the toll-booth must have preceded his selection as an Apostle, lead us to the conviction that the feast was given afterwards; and, indeed, Archbishop Newcome, in his *Harmony of the Gospels*, p. 259, says "that Levi's call and feast were separated in the most ancient Harmonies from Tatian, in A.D. 170, to Gerson, A.D. 1400" (see Andrews' *Life of our Lord*, p. 211); and he might have added, down to many modern commentators.

which they were casting on their Lord. But Jesus probably heard of their murmurs before the feast was over. There was something characteristic in the way in which the criticism was made. The Pharisees, still a little dubious as to Christ's real character and mission, evidently overawed by His greatness, and not yet having ventured upon an open rupture with Him, only vented their ill-humor on the disciples, asking *them* "why their Master ate with publicans and sinners?" The simple-minded Apostles were perhaps unable to explain; but Jesus at once faced the opposition, and told these murmuring respectabilities that He came not to the self-righteous, but to the conscious sinners. He came not to the folded flock, but to the straying sheep. To preach the Gospel to the poor, to extend mercy to the lost, was the very object for which He tabernacled among men. It was His will *not* to thrust His grace on those who from the very first wilfully steeled their hearts against it, but gently to extend it to those who needed and felt their need of it. His teaching was to be "as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass." And then, referring them to one of those palmary passages of the Old Testament (Hos. vi. 6)[1] which even in those days had summed up the very essence of all that was pleasing to God in love and mercy, He borrowed the phrase of their own Rabbis, and bade *them* — these teachers of the people, who claimed to know so much — to "go and learn"[2] what *that* meaneth, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice." Perhaps it had never before occurred to their astonished minds, overlaid as they were by a crust of mere Levitism and tradition, that the love which thinks it no condescension to mingle with sinners in the effort to win their souls, is more pleasing to God than thousands of rams and tens of thousands of rivers of oil.

The answer to the somewhat querulous question asked Him by John's disciples was less severe in tone.[3] No doubt He pitied that natural dejection of mind which arose from the

[1] The quotation is from the Hebrew. The LXX. has ἤ for καὶ οὐ. Comp. Matt. xii. 7; 1 Sam. xv. 22; Deut. x. 12; Prov. xxi. 3; Eccles. xii. 13; Hosea vi. 6; Micah vi. 8; passages amply sufficient to have shown the Jews, had they *really* searched the Scriptures, the hollowness and falsity of the whole Pharisaic system.

[2] Matt. ix. 13, צא ולמד. On the interesting question of the language ordinarily used by our Lord, see Chap. VII., p. 83.

[3] Matt. ix. 14–17; Mark ii. 18–22; Luke v. 33–39. Apparently the Pharisees, eager to seize any and every opportunity to oppose Him, and glad of a combination so powerful and so unwonted as that which enabled them to unite with John's disciples, joined in this question also (Mark ii. 18).

position of the great teacher, to whom alone they had as yet learned to look, and who now lay in the dreary misery of a Machaerus dungeon. He might have answered that fasting was at the best a work of supererogation — useful, indeed, and obligatory, if any man felt that thereby he was assisted in the mortification of anything which was evil in his nature — but worse than useless if it merely ministered to his spiritual pride, and led him to despise others. He might have pointed out to them that although they had instituted a fast twice in the week,[1] this was but a traditional institution, so little sanctioned by the Mosaic law, that in it but *one single day* of fasting was appointed for the entire year.[2] He might, too, have added that the reason why fasting had *not* been made a universal duty is probably that spirit of mercy which recognized how differently it worked upon different temperaments, fortifying some against the attacks of temptation, but only hindering others in the accomplishment of duty. Or again, He might have referred them to those passages in their own Prophets, which pointed out that, in the sight of God, the true fasting is not mere abstinence from food while all the time the man is "smiting with the fist of wickedness;" but rather to love mercy, and to do justice, and to let the oppressed go free.[3] But instead of all these lessons, which, in their present state, might only have exasperated their prejudices, He answers them only by a gentle *argumentum ad hominem*. Referring to the fine image in which their own beloved and revered teacher had spoken of Him as the bridegroom, He contented himself with asking them, "Can ye make the children of the bridechamber fast,[4] while the

[1] On Thursday, because on that day Moses was believed to have reascended Mount Sinai; on Monday, because on that day he returned. Cf. Luke xviii. 12; *Babha Kuma*, f. 82 *a*.

[2] The Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 29; Numb. xxix. 7). It appears that in the period of the exile four annual fasts (in the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months) had sprung up, but they certainly receive no special sanction from the Prophets (Zech. viii. 19; vii. 1–12). In the oldest and genuine part of the *Megillah Taanith*, which emanated from the schools of Hillel and Shammai, there is merely a list of days on which fasting and mourning are *forbidden*. It will be found with a translation in Derenbourg, *Hist. Palestine*, pp. 439–446. See too Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* in Matt. ix. 14.

[3] See the many noble and splendid utterances of the prophets to this effect (Micah vi. 6–8; Hosea vi. 6; xii. 6; Amos v. 21–24; Isa. i. 10–20).

[4] John iii. 29. The use of the word πενθεῖν, "mourn," instead of νηστεύειν, "fast," in Matt. ix. 15, gives still greater point to the question. Fasting was a sign of sorrow, but the kingdom of God was a kingdom of gladness, and the bridal to which their own Master had compared its proclamation was a time of joy. The disciples are the paranymphs, the children of the bridechamber, the *benî hahachunnah*, a thoroughly Hebrew metaphor for the nearest friends of the wedded pair.

bridegroom is with them?" and then, looking calmly down at the deep abyss which yawned before Him, He uttered a saying which — although at that time none probably understood it — was perhaps the very earliest public intimation that He gave of the violent end which awaited Him — "But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them,[1] and then shall they fast in those days." Further He told them, in words of yet deeper significance, though expressed, as so often, in the homeliest metaphors, that His religion is, as it were, a robe entirely new, not a patch of unteazled cloth upon an old robe, serving only to make worse its original rents;[2] that it is not new wine, put in all its fresh fermenting, expansive strength, into old and worn wine-skins, and so serving only to burst the wine-skins and be lost, but *new* wine in *fresh* wine-skins.[3] The new spirit was to be embodied in wholly renovated forms; the new freedom was to be untrammelled by obsolete and long meaningless limitations; the spiritual doctrine was to be sundered forever from mere elaborate and external ceremonials.

St. Luke also has preserved for us the tender and remarkable addition — "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is excellent."[4] Perhaps the fact that these words were found to be obscure has caused the variety of readings in the original text. There is nothing less like the ordinary character of man than to make allowance for difference of opinion in matters of religion; yet it is the duty of doing this which the words imply. He had been showing them that His kingdom was something more than a restitution (ἀποκατάστασις), it was a re-creation (παλιγγενεσία); but He knew how hard it was for men trained in the tradition of the Pharisees, and in admiration for the noble asceticism of the Baptist, to accept truths which were to them both new and strange; and, therefore, even when He is endeavoring to lighten their darkness, He shows that He can look on them "with larger other eyes, to make allowance for them all."

[1] A dim hint of the same kind had been given in the private conversation with Nicodemus (John iii. 14). The word ἀπαρθῇ, clearly implying a violent termination of His career, which is here used by each of the Synoptists (Matt. ix. 15; Mark ii. 20), occurs nowhere else in the New Testament.

[2] Matt. ix. 16, ῥάκους ἀγνάφου.

[3] οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον (Luke v. 38). Similes not unlike this may be found in heathen literature, and we know that our Lord did not shun such existing parallels (Acts xxvi. 14). The fact, however, that His next words in St. Luke (v. 38) run into an iambic line, οὐδεὶς . . πιὼν παλαιὸν εὐθέως θέλει νέον, is probably as purely accidental as the previous iambic in verse 21, τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας;

[4] Leg. χρηστός. (ℵ, B, L)

CHAPTER XXV.

THE DAY OF MATTHEW'S FEAST (*continued*).

"Is there no physician there?" — JER. viii. 22.

THE feast was scarcely over at the house of Matthew,[1] and Jesus was still engaged in the kindly teaching which arose out of the question of John's disciples, when another event occurred which led in succession to three of the greatest miracles of His earthly life.[2]

A ruler of the synagogue — the *rosh hakkenéseth*, or chief elder of the congregation, to whom the Jews looked with great respect — came to Jesus in extreme agitation. It is not improbable that this ruler of the synagogue had been one of the very deputation who had pleaded with Jesus for the centurion-proselyte by whom it had been built. If so, he knew by experience the power of Him to whom he now appealed. Flinging himself at His feet with broken words[3] — which in the original still sound as though they were interrupted and rendered incoherent by bursts of grief — he tells Him that his little daughter, his only daughter, is dying, is dead; but still, if He will but come and lay His hand upon her, she shall live. With the tenderness which could not be deaf to a mourner's cry, Jesus rose[4] at once from the table, and went with him, followed not only by His disciples, but also by a dense expectant multitude, which had been witness of the scene. And as he went the people in their eagerness pressed upon Him and thronged Him.

But among this throng containing doubtless some of the Pharisees and of John's disciples with whom He had been discoursing, as well as some of the publicans and sinners

[1] The note of time in Matt. ix. 18, "while He spake these things unto them," is here quite explicit; and St. Matthew is most likely to have followed the exact order of events on a day which was to him so memorable, as his last farewell to his old life as a Galilæan publican.

[2] Matt. ix. 18–26; Mark v. 22–43; Luke viii. 41–56.

[3] Mark v. 23. Considering the position of Jairus, this little incident strikingly shows the estimation in which Jesus was held at this time even by men of leading position.

[4] Matt. ix. 19, ἐγερθείς.

with whom He had been seated at the feast — there was one who had not been attracted by curiosity to witness what would be done for the ruler of the synagogue. It was a woman who for twelve years had suffered from a distressing malady, which unfitted her for all the relationships of life, and which was peculiarly afflicting, because in the popular mind it was regarded as a direct consequence of sinful habits. In vain had she wasted her substance and done fresh injury to her health in the effort to procure relief from many different physicians,[1] and now, as a last desperate resource, she would try what could be gained without money and without price from the Great Physician. Perhaps, in her ignorance, it was because she had no longer any reward to offer; perhaps because she was ashamed in her feminine modesty to reveal the malady from which she had been suffering; but from whatever cause, she determined, as it were, to steal from Him, unknown, the blessing for which she longed. And so, with the strength and pertinacity of despair, she struggled in that dense throng until she was near enough to touch Him; and then, perhaps all the more violently from her extreme nervousness, she grasped the white fringe of His robe. By the law of Moses every Jew was to wear at each corner of his *tallîth* a fringe or tassel, bound by a ribbon of symbolic blue, to remind him that he was holy to God.[2] Two of these fringes usually hung down at the bottom of the robe; one hung over the shoulder where the robe was folded round the person. It was probably this one that she touched [3] with secret and trembling haste, and then, feeling instantly that she had gained her desire and was healed, she shrank back unnoticed into the throng. Unnoticed by others, but not by Christ. Perceiving that healing power had gone out of Him, recognizing the one magnetic touch of timid faith even amid the pressure of the crowd, He stopped and asked,

[1] Mark v. 26, *πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν*. The physician-Evangelist St. Luke (viii. 43) mentions that in this attempt she had wasted all her substance (*ὅλον τὸν βίον*). This might well have been the case if they had recommended to her nothing better than the strange Talmudic recipes mentioned by Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. in Marc.* v. 26. (See Wunderbar, *Biblisch-talmudische Medicin.*) The recipes are not, however, worse than those given by Luther in his *Table Talk*, who (in the old English translation of the book) exclaims, "How great is the mercy of God who has put such healing virtue in all manner of muck!"

[2] Numb. xv. 37–40; Deut. xxii. 12. The Hebrew word is *kanephôth*, literally, "wings:" and the white tassels with their blue or purple thread were called *tsîtsith*.

[3] It is not easy to stoop down in a thick moving crowd, nor could she have done so unobserved.

"Who touched my clothes?" There was something almost impatient in the reply of Peter, as though in such a throng he thought it absurd to ask, "Who touched me?"[1] But Jesus, His eyes still wandering over the many faces, told him that there was a difference between the crowding of curiosity and the touch of faith, and as at last His glance fell on the poor woman, she, perceiving that she had erred in trying to filch the blessing which He would have graciously bestowed, came forward fearing and trembling, and, flinging herself at His feet, told Him all the truth. All her feminine shame and fear were forgotten in her desire to atone for her fault. Doubtless she dreaded His anger, for the law expressly ordained that the touch of one afflicted as she was, caused ceremonial uncleanness till the evening.[2] But His touch had cleansed her, not hers polluted Him. So far from being indignant, He said to her, "Daughter" — and at once the sound of that gracious word sealed her pardon — "go for peace:[3] thy faith hath saved thee; be healed from thy disease."

The incident must have caused a brief delay, and, as we have seen, to the anguish of Jairus every instant was critical. But he was not the only sufferer who had a claim on the Saviour's mercy; and, as he uttered no complaint, it is clear that sorrow had not made him selfish. But at this moment a messenger reached him with the brief message — "Thy daughter is dead;" and then, apparently with a touch of dislike and irony, he added, "Worry not the Rabbi."[4]

The message had not been addressed to Jesus, but He overheard it,[5] and with a compassionate desire to spare the

[1] "Illi *premunt*, ista tetigit" (Aug., *Serm.* ccxlv.). "Caro premit, fides tangit" (*id.* lxii. 4). Trench, *Miracles*. p. 204.)

[2] Lev. xv. 19. The Pharisees shrunk from a woman's touch, as they do now. "The *chakams* were especially careful to avoid being touched by any part of the women's dresses" (Frankl, *Jews in the East*, ii. 81).

[3] As before (Luke vii. 50), this corresponds to the Hebrew expression, לְשָׁלוֹם. Our Lord addressed no other woman by the title Θύγατερ. Legend has assigned to this woman Veronica as a name, and Paneas (Cæsarea Philippi) as a residence. An ancient statue of bronze at this place was believed to represent her in the act of touching the fringe of Christ's robe; and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vii. 18) and Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 21) both mention this statue, which is believed to have been so curious a testimony to the reality of Christ's miracle, that Julian the Apostate — or, according to another account, Maximus — is charged with having destroyed it.

[4] The curious word σκύλλε, something like our "worry," or "bother," is used here, and here alone (except in Luke vii. 6), by both St. Mark and St. Luke. (The ἐσκυλμένοι of Matt. ix. 36 is a dubious reading.)

[5] Mark v. 36, παράκουσας (א, B, L). The word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament.

poor father from needless agony, He said to him those memorable words, "Fear not, only believe." They soon arrived at his house, and found it occupied by the hired mourners and flute-players, who, as they beat their breasts, with mercenary clamor, insulted the dumbness of sincere sorrow, and the patient majesty of death.[1] Probably this simulated wailing would be very repulsive to the soul of Christ; and first stopping at the door to forbid any of the multitude to follow Him, He entered the house with three only of the inmost circle of His Apostles — Peter, and James, and John. On entering, His first care was to still the idle noise; but when His kind declaration — "The little maid[2] is not dead, but sleepeth" — was only received with coarse ridicule,[3] He indignantly ejected the paid mourners.[4] When calm was restored, He took with Him the father and the mother and His three Apostles, and entered with quiet reverence the chamber hallowed by the silence and awfulness of death. Then, taking the little cold dead hand, He uttered these two thrilling words, "*Talitha cumi*" —"Little maid, arise!"[5] and her spirit returned, and the child arose and walked. An awful amazement seized the parents;[6] but Jesus calmly bade them give the child some food. And if He added His customary warning that they should not speak of what had happened, it was not evidently in the intention that the entire fact should remain unknown — for that would have been impossible, when all the circumstances had been witnessed by so many — but because those who have received from God's hand unbounded mercy are more likely to rev-

[1] At this time among the Jews, no less than among the Romans,

> "Cantabat fanis, cantabat tibia ludis,
> Cantabat moestis tibia funeribus." (Ov. *Fast.* vi.)

The Rabbinic rule provided that there should be at least two flute-players, and one mourning-woman (Selden, *Uxor. Hebr.* iii. 8). The amount of noise indicated by the θόουβοι κλαίοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλὰ (Mark v. 38) recalls to us the "Quantum non superant *tria funera*" of Hor. *Sat.* i. 6, 43. The custom was doubtless ancient (Eccles. xii. 5; Jer. ix. 17; Amos v. 16; 2 Chron. xxxv. 25). St. Luke adds the beating on the breast (viii. 52; cf. Nahum ii. 7). The custom still continues; "they weep, howl, beat their breasts, and tear their hair according to contract" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, I., ch. viii.).

[2] Mark v. 39, τὸ παιδίον. She was twelve years old.

[3] The Evangelists use the strong expression, κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.

[4] Mark v. 40, ἐκβαλὼν ἅπαντας.

[5] Doubtless St. Peter, who was actually present, told his friend and kinsman Mark the actual words which Christ had used. They are interesting also as bearing on the question of the language which He generally spoke.

[6] Mark v. 42, ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ.

erence that mercy with adoring gratitude if it be kept like a hidden treasure in the inmost heart.

Crowding and overwhelming as had been the incidents of this long night and day, it seems probable from St. Matthew that it was signalized by yet one more astonishing work of power. For as He departed thence two blind men followed Him with the cry — as yet unheard — "Son of David, have mercy on us." Already Christ had begun to check, as it were, the spontaneity of His miracles. He had performed more than sufficient to attest His power and mission, and it was important that men should pay more heed to His divine eternal teaching than to His temporal healings. Nor would He as yet sanction the premature, and perhaps ill-considered, use of the Messianic title "Son of David" — a title which, had He publicly accepted it, might have thwarted His sacred purposes, by leading to an instantaneous revolt in His favor against the Roman power. Without noticing the men or their cry, He went to the house in Capernaum where He abode; nor was it until they had persistently followed Him into the house that He tested their faith by the question, "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" They said unto Him, "Yea, Lord." Then touched He their eyes, saying, "According to your faith be it unto you." And their eyes were opened. Like so many whom He healed, they neglected His stern command not to reveal it.[1] There are some who have admired their disobedience, and have attributed it to the enthusiasm of gratitude and admiration; but was it not rather the enthusiasm of a blatant wonder, the vulgarity of a chattering boast? How many of these multitudes who had been healed by Him became His true disciples? Did not the holy fire of devotion which a hallowed silence must have kept alive upon the altar of their hearts die away in the mere blaze of empty rumor? Did not He know best? Would not obedience have been better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams? Yes. It is possible to deceive ourselves; it is possible to offer to Christ a *seeming* service which disobeys His inmost precepts — to *grieve* Him, under the guise of honoring Him, by vain repetitions, and empty genuflexions, and bitter intolerance, and irreverent familiarity, and the hollow simulacrum of a dead devotion. Better, far better to serve Him by doing the things He said than by a seeming zeal, often false in exact proportion to

[1] Matt. ix. 27–31.

its obtrusiveness, for the glory of His name. These disobedient babblers, who talked so much of Him, did but offer Him the dishonoring service of a double heart; their violation of His commandment served only to hinder His usefulness, to trouble His spirit, and to precipitate His death.

CHAPTER XXVI.

A VISIT TO JERUSALEM.

"Simplicity is the best viaticum for the Christian." — CLEM. ALEX. *Paed.* ii.

ANY one who has carefully and repeatedly studied the Gospel narratives side by side, in order to form from them as clear a conception as is possible of the life of Christ on earth, can hardly fail to have been struck with two or three general facts respecting the sequence of events in His public ministry. In spite of the difficulty introduced by the varying and non-chronological arrangements of the Synoptists, and by the silence of the fourth Gospel about the main part of the preaching in Galilee, we see distinctly the following circumstances: —

1. That the innocent enthusiasm of joyous welcome with which Jesus and His words and works were at first received in Northern Galilee gradually, but in a short space of time, gave way to suspicion, dislike, and even hostility on the part of large and powerful sections of the people.

2. That the external character, as well as the localities, of our Lord's mission were much altered after the murder of John the Baptist.

3. That the tidings of this murder, together with a marked development of opposition, and the constant presence of Scribes and Pharisees from Judæa to watch His conduct and dog His movements, seems to synchronize with a visit to Jerusalem not recorded by the Synoptists, but evidently identical with the nameless festival mentioned in John v. 1.

4. That this unnamed festival must have occurred somewhere about that period of His ministry at which we have now arrived.

What this feast was we shall consider immediately; but it was preceded by another event — the mission of the Twelve Apostles.

At the close of the missionary journeys, during which occurred some of the events described in the last chapters, Jesus was struck with compassion at the sight of the multi-

tude.[1] They reminded Him of sheep harassed by enemies, and lying panting and neglected in the fields because they have no shepherd.[2] They also called up to the mind the image of a harvest ripe, but unreaped for lack of laborers; and He bade His Apostles pray to the Lord of the harvest that He would send forth laborers into His harvest. And then, immediately afterwards, having Himself now traversed the whole of Galilee, He sent them out two and two to confirm His teaching and perform works of mercy in His name.[3]

Before sending them He naturally gave them the instructions which were to guide their conduct. At present they were to confine their mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and not extend it to Samaritans or Gentiles. The topic of their preaching was to be the nearness of the kingdom of heaven, and it was to be freely supported by works of power and beneficence. They were to take nothing with them; no scrip for food; no purse for money; no change of raiment;[4] no travelling-shoes (*ὑποδήματα, calcei*) in place of their ordinary palm-bark sandals; they were not even to procure a staff for the journey if they did not happen already to possess one;[5] their mission — like all the greatest and most effective missions which the world has ever known — was to be simple and self-supporting. The open hospitality of the East, so often used as the basis for a dissemination of new thoughts, would be ample for their maintenance.[6]

[1] Matt. ix. 35–38.

[2] Ver. 36, *ἐσκυλμένοι . . . ἐρριμμένοι*; the reading *ἐκλελυμενοι* is perhaps a gloss for the unfamiliar word.

[3] Matt. x. 1-42; Mark vi. 7–13; Luke ix. 1–6.

[4] Few ordinary peasants in the East can boast of a change of garments. They even sleep in the clothes which they wear during the day.

[5] That this was the meaning of the injunctions appears from a comparison of the three Evangelists. The *μηδὲ ῥάβδον* of Matt. x. 10 depends on *μὴ κτήσησθε*, "do not *procure* for the purposes of this journey," and is therefore no contradiction to the *εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον* of Mark vi. 8. Keim's remarks — "Diese Wendung der Dinge hat dann freilich dem Markus nicht eingeleuchtet; er ist kein Freund der nackten Armuth. . . . . aber für Mitnahme eines Stockes und Anlegung von Sandalen spricht er sich *mit grosser fast komischer* Bestimmtheit aus" (*Gesch. Jesu*, II. i., p. 327) — are captious and shallow. As regards these minute differences, we may observe that probably in many instances they merely arise from the fact that our Lord used Aramaic phrases, which are capable of trivial variation in the limits within which they were understood: *e.g.*, if here He said, אִם מַטֶּה, it might mean, "even if ye have a staff, it is superfluous." (Ebrard, *Gosp. History*, p. 295, E. Tr.)

[6] Renan notices the modern analogy. When travelling in the East no one need ever scruple to go into the best house of any Arab village to which he comes, and he will always be received with profuse and gratuitous hospitality. From the moment we entered any house it was regarded

On entering a town they were to go to any house in it where they had reason to hope that they would be welcome, and to salute it with the immemorial and much-valued blessing, *Shalôm lakem*,[1] "Peace be to you," and if the children of peace were there the blessing would be effective; if not, it would return on their own heads. If rejected, they were to shake off the dust of their feet in witness that they had spoken faithfully, and that they thus symbolically cleared themselves of all responsibility for that judgment which should fall more heavily on wilful and final haters of the light than on the darkest places of a heathendom in which the light had never, or but feebly, shone.

So far their Lord had pointed out to them the duties of trustful faith, of gentle courtesy, of self-denying simplicity, as the first essentials of missionary success. He proceeded to fortify them against the inevitable trials and persecutions of their missionary work.

They needed and were to exercise the wisdom of serpents no less than the harmlessness of doves; for He was sending them forth as sheep among wolves.

Doubtless these discourses were not always delivered in the continuous form in which they have naturally come down to us. Our Lord seems at all times to have graciously encouraged the questions of humble and earnest listeners; and at this point we are told by an ancient tradition,[2] that St. Peter — ever, we may be sure, a most eager and active-minded listener — interrupted his Master with the not unnatural question, "But how then if the wolves should tear

as our own. There is not an Arab you meet who will not empty for you the last drop in his water-skin, or share with you his last piece of black bread. The Rabbis said that Paradise was the reward of willing hospitality. (Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr.* 108.)

[1] שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם (Gen. xliii. 23). It was believed to include every blessing. Have not our missionaries sometimes erred from forgetting the spirit of this injunction? It has been too caustically and bitterly said — and yet the saying may find some occasional justification — that missionaries have too often proceeded on the plan of (1) discovering all the prejudices of a people, and (2) shocking them. Doubtless this has been only due to an ill-guided zeal; but so did not St. Paul. He was most courteous and most conciliatory in his address to the Athenians, and he lived for three and a half years at Ephesus, without once reviling or insulting the worshippers of Artemis.

[2] Clemens Romanus, xi. 5 (about A.D. 140; see Lightfoot's *Clemens Romanus*). This is one of the ἄγραφα δόγματα, unwritten traditional sayings of our Lord, which there is no reason to doubt. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει, Ἐαν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τα ἀρνία· Εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ, Μὴ φοβηθέντα τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά. The remainder of the passage is merely a reference to Matt. x. 28.

the lambs?" And Jesus answered, smiling perhaps at the naïve and literal intellect of His chief Apostle, "Let not the lambs fear the wolves when the lambs are once dead, and do you fear not those who can kill you and do nothing to you, but fear Him who after you are dead hath power over soul and body to cast them into hell fire." And then, continuing the thread of His discourse, He warned them plainly how, both at this time and again long afterwards, they might be brought before councils, and scourged in synagogues,[1] and stand at the judgment-bar of kings, and yet, without any anxious premeditation,[2] the Spirit should teach them what to say. The doctrine of peace should be changed by the evil passions of men into a war-cry of fury and hate, and they might be driven to fly before the face of enemies from city to city. Still let them endure to the end, for before they had gone through the cities of Israel, the Son of Man should have come.[3]

Then, lastly, He at once warned and comforted them by reminding them of what He Himself had suffered, and how He had been opposed. Let them not fear. The God who cared even for the little birds when they fell to the ground[4] — the God by whom the very hairs of their head were numbered — the God who (and here he glanced back perhaps at the question of Peter) held in His hand the issues, not of life and death only, but of *eternal* life and of *eternal* death, and who was therefore more to be feared than the wolves of earth — He was with them; He would acknowledge those whom His Son acknowledged, and deny those whom He denied. They were being sent forth into a world of strife, which would seem even the more deadly because of the peace which it rejected. Even their nearest and their dearest might side with the world against them. But they who would be His true followers must for His sake give up *all;* must even take up their cross[5] and follow Him. But then, for their

[1] For the *συνέδρια* see Deut. xvi. 18. For the power of the synagogue officers to punish by scourging, see Acts. v. 40; 2 Cor. xi. 24.

[2] Matt. x. 19. The "take no thought" of the A. V. is too strong; as in Matt. vi. 25, it means "be not *over-anxious* about."

[3] This glance into the farther future probably belongs to a much later discourse; and the coming of the Son of Man is here understood in its first and narrower signification of the downfall of Judaism, and the establishment of a kingdom of Christ on earth, which some at least among them lived to see.

[4] Matt. x. 29. Little birds are still strung together and sold for "two farthings" in the towns of Palestine.

[5] If this were not a proverbial allusion (as seems probable from its use in Plutarch. *De. Ser. Num. Vind.* ix., *ἕκαστος κακοίργων ἐκφέρει τὸν αὐτοῦ σταῦρον*),

comfort, He told them that they should be as He was in the world; that they who received them should receive Him; that to lose their lives for His sake would be to more than find them; that a cup of cold water given to the youngest and humblest of His little ones[1] should not miss of its reward.

Such is an outline of these great parting instructions as given by St. Matthew, and every missionary and every minister should write them in letters of gold. The sterility of missionary labor is a constant subject of regret and discouragement among us. Would it be so if all our missions were carried out in this wise and conciliatory, in this simple and self-abandoning, in this faithful and dauntless spirit? Was a missionary ever unsuccessful who, being enabled by the grace of God to live in the light of such precepts as these,[2] worked as St. Paul worked, or St. Francis Xavier, or Henry Martyn, or Adoniram Judson, or John Eliot, or David Schwarz?

That the whole of this discourse was not delivered on this occasion,[3] that there are references in it to later periods,[4] that parts of it are only applicable to other apostolic missions which as yet lay far in the future,[5] seems clear; but we may, nevertheless, be grateful that St. Matthew, guided as usual by unity of subject, collected into one focus the scattered rays of instruction delivered, perhaps, on several subsequent occasions — as for instance, before the sending of the Seventy, and even as the parting utterances of the risen Christ.[6]

it must have been a dark saying to the Apostles at this time. Perhaps it belongs to a much later occasion, after He had distinctly prophesied the certainty and nature of His future sufferings.

[1] Alford ingeniously conjectures that some children may have been present.

[2] Of course I do not imply that a missionary is *bound* to serve gratuitously; *that* would be against the distinct statement of our Lord (Matt. x. 10, 11); yet there *are* occasions when even this may be desirable (1 Cor. ix. 15–19; 2 Cor. xi. 9–12; 1 Thess. ii. 9, etc.). But Christ meant all His commands to be interpreted according to their spirit, and we must not overlook the fact that this method of preaching *was* (and *is*) made more common and easy in the East than for us. "Nor was there in this," says Dr. Thomson, "any departure from the simple manners of the country. At this day the farmer sets out on excursions quite as extensive without a *para* in his purse; and the modern Moslem prophet of Tarishiidehah thus sends forth his apostles over this identical region" (*The Land and the Book*, p. 346).

[3] St. Mark and St. Luke only give, at this juncture, an epitome of its first section.

[4] *Ex. gr.*, perhaps some of the expressions in verses 8, 23, 25, 38.

[5] *Ex. gr.*, verses 18–23.

[6] Cf. Mark xvi. 15–18; Luke x. 2–12; Luke xxiv. 47.

The Jews were familiar with the institution of *Sheluchîm*, the plenipotentiaries of some higher authority. This was the title by which Christ seems to have marked out the position of His Apostles. It was a wise and merciful provision that He sent them out two and two;[1] it enabled them to hold sweet converse together, and mutually to correct each other's faults. Doubtless the friends and the brothers went in pairs; the fiery Peter with the more contemplative Andrew; the Sons of Thunder — one influential and commanding, the other emotional and eloquent; the kindred faith and guilelessness of Philip and Bartholomew; the slow but faithful Thomas with the thoughtful and devoted Matthew; James with his brother Jude; the zealot Simon to fire with his theocratic zeal the dark, flagging, despairing spirit of the traitor Judas.

During their absence Jesus continued His work alone,[2] perhaps as He slowly made His way towards Jerusalem; for if we can speak of probability at all amid the deep uncertainties of the chronology of His ministry, it seems extremely probable that it is to this point that the verse belongs — "After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem."[3]

In order not to break the continuity of the narrative, I shall omit the discussion here, but I shall in the Appendix[4] give ample reasons, as far as the *text* is concerned, and as far as the *time* required by the narrative is concerned, for believing that this nameless feast was in all probability the Feast of Purim.

But how came Jesus to go up to Jerusalem for such a feast as this — a feast which was the saturnalia of Judaism; a feast which was without divine authority,[5] and had its roots in the most intensely exclusive, not to say vindictive, feelings of the nation; a feast of merriment and masquerade, which was purely social and often discreditably convivial; a feast which was unconnected with religious services, and was

[1] The Rabbis held it a fault to journey without a friend with whom to converse about the sacred Law (*Soh. Chad.*, f. 61, 1; Schöttgen, p. 89).

[2] Matt. xi. 1.

[3] John v. 1. Omitted by the Synoptists, who, until the close, narrate only the ministry in Galilee.

[4] See Excursus VIII., "The Unnamed Feast of John v. 1."

[5] To such an extent was this the case, that no less than eighty-five elders are said to have protested against its original institution, regarding it as an innovation against the Law (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on John x. 22). It seems to have originated among the Jews of the dispersion.

observed, not in the Temple, not even necessarily in the synagogues, but mainly in the private houses of the Jews?[1]

The answer seems to be that, although Jesus was in Jerusalem at this feast, and went up about the time that it was held, the words of St. John do not necessarily imply that He went up for the express purpose of being present at this particular festival. The Passover took place only a month afterwards, and He may well have gone up *mainly* with the intention of being present at the Passover, although He gladly availed Himself of an opportunity for being in Judæa and Jerusalem a month before it, both that He might once more preach in those neighborhoods, and that He might avoid the publicity and dangerous excitement involved in His joining the caravan of the Passover pilgrims from Galilee. Such an opportunity may naturally have arisen from the absence of the Apostles on their missionary tour. The Synoptists give clear indications that Jesus had friends and well-wishers at Jerusalem and in its vicinity. He must therefore have paid visits to those regions which they do not record. Perhaps it was among those friends that He awaited the return of His immediate followers. We know the deep affection which He entertained for the members of one household in Bethany, and it is not unnatural to suppose that He was now living in the peaceful seclusion of that pious household as a solitary and honored guest.

But even if St. John intends us to believe that the occurrence of this feast was the immediate cause of this visit to Jerusalem, we must bear in mind that there is no proof whatever of its having been in our Lord's time the fantastic and disorderly commemoration which it subsequently became. The nobler-minded Jews doubtless observed it in a calm and grateful manner; and as one part of the festival consisted in showing acts of kindness to the poor, it may have offered an attraction to Jesus both on this ground, and because it enabled Him to show that there was nothing unnational or unpatriotic in the universal character of His message, or the all-embracing infinitude of the charity which He both practised and enjoined.

[1] Perhaps more nearly resembling in its origin and character our Guy Fawkes' Day than anything else. Caspari calls it "ein Rache-, Fluch- und Sauffest" (*Chronol. Geogr. Einl.*, p. 113); but there is no proof that it was so at *that* time. In this particular year, the Feast of Purim seems to have coincided with a Sabbath (John v. 10), an arrangement carefully avoided in the later Jewish calendar. (See Wieseler, *Synopsis*, p. 199, E. Tr.)

There remains then but a single question. The Passover was rapidly drawing near, and His presence at that great feast would on every ground be expected. Why then did He absent Himself from it? Why did He return to Galilee instead of remaining at Jerusalem? The events which we are about to narrate will furnish a sufficient answer to this question.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE MIRACLE AT BETHESDA.

Εἰς ἀπεραντολογίαν οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων διδάσκαλοι ἐληλύθασι φάσκοντες βάσταγμα μὲν εἶναι τὸ τοίονδε ὑπόδημα οὐ μὴν τὸ τοίονδε, κ. τ. λ. — ORIG. *Opp.* i. 179.

THERE was in Jerusalem, near the Sheep-gate, a pool, which was believed to possess remarkable healing properties. For this reason, in addition to its usual name, it had been called in Hebrew "Bethesda," or the House of Mercy,[1] and under the porticos which adorned the pentagonal masonry in which it was enclosed lay a multitude of sufferers from blindness, lameness, and atrophy, waiting to take advantage of the bubbling and gushing of the water, which showed that its medicinal properties were at their highest. There is no indication in the narrative, that any one who thus used the water was *at once*, or *miraculously*, healed; but the repeated use of an intermittent and gaseous spring — and more than one of the springs about Jerusalem continue to be of this character to the present day — was doubtless likely to produce most beneficial results.

A very early popular legend, which has crept by interpolation into the text of St. John,[2] attributed the healing qual-

[1] John v. 2, ἐπιλεγομένη. There are great varieties of reading; Tischendorf, with ℵ, reads βηθζαθα. Perhaps this is sufficient to account for the silence of Josephus, who may mention it under another name. The pool now pointed out to the traveller as Bethesda is *Birket Israel*, which seems, however, to have formed part of the deep fosse round the Tower of Antonia. The pool *may* have been the one now known as the Fountain of the Virgin, not far from Siloam, and connected with it (as Dr. Robinson discovered, *Bibl. Researches*, i. 506) by a subterranean passage. He himself had an opportunity of observing the *intermittent* character of this fountain, which, he was told, bubbles up "at irregular intervals, sometimes two and three times a day, and sometimes in summer once in two or three days." (*Bibl. Researches*, i. 341.)

[2] The weight of evidence both external and internal against the genuineness of John v. 3, 4 (from the word ἐκδεχομένων) seems to me overwhelming. 1. It is omitted by not a few of the weightiest MSS. and versions (ℵ, B, D, the Cureton Syriac). 2. In others in which it does occur it is obelized as dubious. 3. It abounds in various readings, showing that there is something suspicious about it. 4. It contains in the short compass of a few lines no less than seven words not found elsewhere in the New Testament, or only found with a different sense. 5. It relates a most

ities of the water to the descent of an angel who troubled the pool at irregular intervals, leaving the first persons who could scramble into it to profit by the immersion. This solution of the phenomenon was in fact so entirely in accordance with the Semitic habit of mind, that, in the universal ignorance of all scientific phenomena, and the utter indifference to close investigation which characterize most Orientals, the populace would not be likely to trouble themselves about the possibility of any other explanation. But whatever may have been the general belief about the *cause*, the *fact* that the water was found at certain intervals to be impregnated with gases which gave it a strengthening property, was sufficient to attract a concourse of many sufferers.

Among these was one poor man who, for no less than thirty-eight years, had been lamed by paralysis. He had haunted the porticos of this pool, but without effect; for as he was left there unaided, and as the motion of the water occurred at irregular times, others more fortunate and less feeble than himself managed time after time to struggle in before him, until the favorable moment had been lost.[1]

Jesus looked on the man with heartfelt pity. It was obvious that the *will* of the poor destitute creature was no less stricken with paralysis than his limbs, and his whole life was one long atrophy of ineffectual despair. But Jesus was minded to make *His* Purim present to the poor, to whom He had neither silver nor gold to give. He would help a fellow-sufferer, whom no one had cared or condescended to help before.

"Willest thou to be made whole?"

startling fact, one wholly unlike anything else in Scripture, one not alluded to by a single other writer, Jewish or heathen, and one which, had there been the slightest ground for believing in its truth, would certainly not have been passed over in silence by Josephus. 6. Its insertion (to explain the word παραχθῇ in verse 7) is easily accounted for; its omission, had it been in the original text, is quite inconceivable. Accordingly, it is rejected from the text by the best editors as a spurious gloss, and indeed there is no earlier trace of its existence than an allusion to it in Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 5). (Ob. circ. A.D. 220.)

[1] Strauss and his school make all kinds of objections to this narrative. "Latterly," as Lange observes, with cutting sarcasm, "a crowd of 'critical' remarks have been seen lying round the pool of Bethesda, like another multitude of blind, lame, and withered." They hold it impossible that the man who, as they assume, must have had some one to take him to the pool, never had any one to put him in at the right time. Such remarks are very trivial. 1. St. John says nothing of any one bringing him to the pool; he may have lived close by, and been able to crawl there himself. 2. He does not say that the pool wrought *instantaneous* cures, or that the man had *never* been put into the troubled water.

At first the words hardly stirred the man's long and despondent lethargy; he scarcely seems even to have looked up. But thinking, perhaps, with a momentary gleam of hope, that this was some stranger who, out of kindness of heart, might help him into the water when it was again agitated, he merely narrated in reply the misery of his long and futile expectation. Jesus had intended a speedier and more effectual aid.

"Rise," He said, "take thy couch, and walk."

It was spoken in an accent that none could disobey. The manner of the Speaker, His voice, His mandate, thrilled like an electric spark through the withered limbs and the shattered constitution, enfeebled by a lifetime of suffering and sin.[1] After thirty-eight years of prostration, the man instantly rose, lifted up his pallet, and began to walk.[2] In glad amazement he looked round to see and to thank his unknown benefactor; but the crowd was large, and Jesus, anxious to escape the unspiritual excitement which would fain have regarded Him as a thaumaturge alone, had quietly slipped away from observation.[3]

In spite of this, many scrupulous and jealous eyes were soon upon Him. In proportion as the inner power and meaning of a religion are dead, in that proportion very often is an exaggerated import attached to its outer forms. Formalism and indifference, pedantic scrupulosity and absolute disbelief, are correlative, and ever flourish side by side. It was so with Judaism in the days of Christ. Its living and burning enthusiasm was quenched; its lofty and noble faith had died away; its prophets had ceased to prophesy; its poets had ceased to sing; its priests were no longer clothed with righteousness; its saints were few. The axe was at the root of the barren tree, and its stem served only to nourish a fungous brood of ceremonials and traditions,

> "Deathlike, and colored like a corpse's cheek."

And thus it was that the observance of the Sabbath, which had been intended to secure for weary men a rest full of love

[1] See verse 14, and below.

[2] The κράββατον was probably nothing more than a mere *paillasse*, or folded *abciyah*. To regard such a trivial effort as a violation of the Sabbath was a piece of superstitious literalism not derived from Scripture, but founded on the Oral Law.

[3] ἐξένευσεν (ver. 13); literally, "swam out." Cf. Eur. *Hippol.* 471; Thuc. ii. 90.

and peace and mercy, had become a mere national fetish — a barren custom fenced in with the most frivolous and senseless restrictions. Well-nigh every great provision of the Mosaic law had now been degraded into a mere superfluity of meaningless minutiæ, the delight of small natures, and the grievous incubus of all true and natural piety.[1]

Now, when a religion has thus decayed into a superstition without having lost its external power, it is always more than ever tyrannous and suspicious in its hunting for heresy. The healed paralytic was soon surrounded by a group of questioners. They looked at him with surprise and indignation.

"It is the Sabbath; it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed."

Here was a flagrant case of violation of their law! Had not the son of Shelomith, though half an Egyptian, been stoned to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath day?[2] Had not the prophet Jeremiah expressly said, "Take heed to yourselves, and bear *no* burden on the Sabbath day"?[3]

Yes; but why? Because the Sabbath was an ordinance of mercy intended to protect the underlings and the oppressed from a life of incessant toil; because it was essential to save the serfs and laborers of the nation from the over-measure of labor which would have been exacted from them in a nation afflicted with the besetting sin of greed; because the setting apart of one day in seven for sacred rest was of infinite value to the spiritual life of all. *That* was the meaning of the Fourth Commandment. In what respect was it violated by the fact that a man who had been healed by a miracle wished to carry home the mere pallet which was perhaps almost the only thing that he possessed? What the man really violated was not the law of God, or even of Moses, but the wretched formalistic inferences of their frigid tradition, which had gravely decided that on the Sabbath a nailed shoe might not be worn because it was a burden, but that an unnailed shoe might be worn; and that a person might go out with two shoes on, but not with only one; and that one man might carry a loaf of bread, but that

[1] The present Jews of Palestine, degraded and contemptible as is their condition — beggars, idlers, cheats, sensualists, as the best of their own countrymen confess them to be — still cling to all their Sabbatarian superstitions: *e.g.*, "The German Jews look upon it as a sin to use a stick of any kind on the Sabbath" (Dr. Frankl, *Jews in the East*, E. Tr. ii. 6).

[2] Lev. xxiv. 10–12; Numb. xv. 32–36.

[3] Jer. xvii. 21.

two men might not carry it between them, and so forth, to the very utmost limit of tyrannous absurdity.[1]

"He that made me whole," replied the man, "*He* said to me, Take up thy bed and walk."

As far as the man was concerned, they accepted the plea; a voice fraught with miraculous power so stupendous that it could heal the impotence of a lifetime by a word, was clearly, as far as the man was concerned, entitled to some obedience. And the fact was that they were actuated by a motive; they were flying at higher game than this insignificant and miserable sufferer. Nothing was to be gained by worrying *him*.

"*Who* is it that" — mark the malignity of these Jewish authorities[2] — not that *made thee whole*, for there was no heresy to be hunted out in the mere fact of exercising miraculous power — but "that gave thee the wicked command to take up thy bed and walk?"

So little apparently, up to this time, was the person of Jesus generally known in the suburbs of Jerusalem, or else so dull and languid had been the man's attention while Jesus was first speaking to him, that he actually did not know who his benefactor was. But he ascertained shortly afterwards. It is a touch of grace about him that we next find him in the Temple, whither he may well have gone to return thanks to God for this sudden and marvellous renovation of his wasted life. There, too, Jesus saw him, and addressed to him one simple memorable warning, "See, thou hast been made whole: continue in sin no longer, lest something worse happen to thee."[3]

Perhaps the warning had been given because Christ read the mean and worthless nature of the man; at any rate, there is something at first sight peculiarly revolting in the 15th verse. "The man *went and told the Jewish authorities* that it was Jesus who had made him whole." It is barely possible, though most unlikely, that he may have meant to magnify the name of One who had wrought such a mighty work; but as he must have been well aware of the angry

[1] ψυχοὰς παραδόσεις φέρουσι (Orig.). These instances of hard and foolish Judaic ἀπεραντολογία, to which Origen expressly alludes, are preserved in the Mishna, *Shabb.* x. 5. (Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 18.)

[2] Such, as we have already observed, is all but invariably the meaning of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι in St. John.

[3] Alford speaks here of "the sin committed thirty-eight years ago, from which this sickness had resulted;" but surely μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε means more than this: it means, "Be sinning — be a sinner — no longer."

feelings of the Jews — as we hear no word of his gratitude or devotion, no word of amazement or glorifying God — as, too, it must have been abundantly clear to him that Jesus in working the miracle had been touched by compassion only, and had been anxious to shun all publicity — it must be confessed that the *primâ facie* view of the man's conduct is that it was an act of needless and contemptible delation — a piece of most pitiful self-protection at the expense of his benefactor — an almost inconceivable compound of feeble sycophancy and base ingratitude. Apparently the warning of Jesus had been most deeply necessary, as, if we judge the man aright, it was wholly unavailing.

For the consequences were immediate and disastrous. They changed in fact the entire tenor of His remaining life. Untouched by the evidence of a most tender compassion, unmoved by the display of miraculous power, the Jewish inquisitors were up in arms to defend their favorite piece of legalism. "They began to *persecute* Jesus *because He did such things on the Sabbath day.*"

And it was in answer to this charge that He delivered the divine and lofty discourse preserved for us in the fifth chapter of St. John. Whether it was delivered in the Temple, or before some committee of the Sanhedrin, we cannot tell; but, at any rate, the great Rabbis and Chief Priests who summoned Him before them that they might rebuke and punish Him for a breach of the Sabbath, were amazed and awed, if also they were bitterly and implacably infuriated, by the words they heard. They had brought Him before them in order to warn, and the warnings fell on *them*. They had wished to instruct and reprove, and then, perhaps, condescendingly, for this once, to pardon; and, lo! He mingles for *them* the majesty of instruction with the severity of compassionate rebuke. They sat round Him in all the pomposities of their office, to overawe Him as an inferior, and, lo! they tremble, and gnash their teeth, though they dare not act, while with words like a flame of fire piercing into the very joints and marrow — with words more full of wisdom and majesty than those which came among the thunders of Sinai — He assumes the awful dignity of the Son of God.

And so the attempt to impress on Him their petty rules and literal pietisms — to lecture Him on the heinousness of working miraculous cures on the Sabbath day — perhaps to punish Him for the enormity of bidding a healed man take

up his bed — was a total failure. With His very first words He exposes their materialism and ignorance. They, in their feebleness, had thought of the Sabbath as though God ceased from working thereon because He was fatigued; He tells them that that holy rest was a beneficent activity. They thought apparently, as men think now, that God had resigned to certain mute forces His creative energy; He tells them that His Father is working still; and He, knowing His Father, and loved of Him, was working with Him, and should do greater works than these which He had now done. Already was He quickening the spiritually dead, and the day should come when all in the tombs should hear His voice. Already He was bestowing eternal life on all that believed on Him; hereafter should His voice be heard in that final judgment of the quick and dead which the Father had committed into His hands.[1]

Was He merely bearing witness of Himself? Nay, there were three mighty witnesses which had testified, and were testifying, of Him — John, whom, after a brief admiration, they had rejected; Moses, whom they boasted of following, and did not understand; God Himself, whom they professed to worship, but had never seen or known. They themselves had sent to John and heard his testimony; but He needed not the testimony of man, and mentioned it only for *their* sakes, because even they for a time had been willing to exult in that great prophet's God-enkindled light.[2] But He had far loftier witness than that of John — the witness of a miraculous power, exerted not as prophets had exerted it, in the name of God, but in His own name, because His Father had given such power into His hand. That Father they knew not: His light they had abandoned for the darkness; His word for their own falsehoods and ignorances; and they were rejecting Him whom He had sent. But there was a *third* testimony. If they knew nothing of the Father, they

[1] The distinction between οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες (the doers of those good deeds which cannot die) and οἱ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες (the slaves and victims of all that is delusive and transitory) is probably intentional.

[2] John v. 35 (cf. Matt. v. 15; Luke xii. 35). He was ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων — the *Lamp*, not the *Light* — being enkindled by Another, and so shining. "He is only as the light of the candle, for whose rays, indeed, men are grateful; but which is pale, flickering, transitory, compared with the glories of the Eternal flame from which itself is kindled" (Lightfoot, *On Revision*, p. 118). Christ is the Light from whom all lamps are kindled. "Then stood up Elias the Prophet, like fire, and his word *burned as a lamp*" (Ecclus. xlviii. 1). "Lychnus orto soli non foenerat lucem" (Bengel). Their "exultation" in the Baptist's teaching had been very shallow — "they *heard*, but *did* not" (Ezek. xxxiii. 32).

at least knew, or thought they knew, the Scriptures; the Scriptures were in their hands; they had counted the very letters of them; yet they were rejecting Him of whom the Scriptures testified. Was it not clear that they — the righteous, the pious, the scrupulous, the separatists, the priests, the religious leaders of their nation — yet had not the love of God in them, if they thus rejected His prophet, His word. His works, His Son?

And what was the fibre of bitterness within them which produced all this bitter fruit? Was it not *pride?* How *could* they believe, who sought honor of one another, and not the honor that cometh of God only? Hence it was that they rejected One who came in His Father name, while they had been, and should be, the ready dupes and the miserable victims of every false Messiah, of every Judas, and Theudas, and Bar-Cochebas — and, in Jewish history, there were more than sixty such — who came in his own name.

And yet He would not accuse them to the Father; they had another accuser, even Moses, in whom they trusted. Yes, Moses, in whose lightest word they professed to trust — over the most trivial precept of whose law they had piled their mountain loads of tradition and commentary — even *him* they were disbelieving and disobeying. Had they believed Moses, they would have believed Him who spoke to them, for Moses wrote of Him; but if they thus rejected the true meaning of the written words (γράμμασιν) which they professed to adore and love, how could they believe the spoken words (ῥήμασιν) to which they were listening with rage and hate?[1]

We know with what deadly exasperation these high utterances were received. Never before had the Christ spoken so plainly. It seemed as though in Galilee He had wished the truth respecting Him to rise like a gradual and glorious dawn upon the souls and understandings of those who heard His teaching and watched His works; but as though at Jerusalem — where His ministry was briefer, and His followers fewer, and His opponents stronger, and His mighty works more rare — He had determined to leave the leaders and rulers of the people without excuse, by revealing at

1 "The Law," says St. Paul, "was our tutor (παιδαγωγὸς) to lead us unto Christ," *i.e.*, into spiritual manhood; into the maturity of the Christian life. (Dr. Lightfoot, on Gal. iii. 24, shows that the ordinary explanation of this text — however beautiful — is untenable.) Cf. John i. 46, "We have found Him of whom *Moses* in *the Law* and the Prophets did write."

once to their astonished ears the nature of His being. More distinctly than this He could not have spoken. They had summoned Him before them to explain His breach of the Sabbath; so far from excusing the act itself, as He sometimes did in Galilee, by showing that the higher and moral law of love supersedes and annihilates the lower law of mere literal and ceremonial obedience — instead of showing that He had but acted in the spirit in which the greatest of saints had acted before Him, and the greatest of prophets taught — He sets Himself wholly above the Sabbath, as its Lord, nay, even as the Son and Interpreter of Him who had made the Sabbath, and who in all the mighty course of Nature and of Providence was continuing to work thereon.

Here, then, were two deadly charges ready at hand against this Prophet of Nazareth: He was a breaker of their Sabbath; He was a blasphemer of their God. The first crime was sufficient cause for opposition and persecution; the second, an ample justification of persistent[1] and active endeavors to bring about His death.

But at present they could do nothing; they could only rage in impotent indignation; they could only gnash with their teeth, and melt away. Whatever may have been the cause, as yet they dared not act. A power greater than their own restrained them. The hour of their triumph was not yet come; only, from this moment, there went forth against Him from the hearts of those Priests and Rabbis and Pharisees the inexorable, irrevocable sentence of violent death.

And under such circumstances it was useless, and worse than useless, for Him to remain in Judæa, where every day was a day of peril from these angry and powerful conspirators. He could no longer remain in Jerusalem for the approaching Passover, but must return to Galilee; but He returned with a clear vision of the fatal end, with full knowledge that the hours of light in which He could still work were already fading into the dusk, and that the rest of His work would be accomplished with the secret sense that death was hanging over His devoted head.

[1] ἐδίωκον — ἐζήτουν ἀποκτεῖναι (John v. 16).

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE MURDER OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

> "It is great sin to swear unto a sin;
> But greater sin to keep a sinful oath.
> Who can be bound by any solemn vow
> To do a murderous deed . . . ?"
>
> SHAKESPEARE, 2 *Henry VI.* v. 2.

IT must have been with His human heart full of foreboding sadness that the Saviour returned to Galilee. In His own obscure Nazareth He had before been violently rejected; He had now been rejected no less decisively at Jerusalem by the leading authorities of His own nation. He was returning to an atmosphere already darkened by the storm-clouds of gathering opposition; and He had scarcely returned when upon that atmosphere, like the first note of a death-knell tolling ruin, there broke the intelligence of a dreadful martyrdom. The heaven-enkindled and shining lamp had suddenly been quenched in blood. The great Forerunner — he who was greatest of those born of women — the Prophet, and more than a prophet, had been foully murdered.

Herod Antipas, to whom, on the death of Herod the Great, had fallen the tetrarchy of Galilee, was about as weak and miserable a prince as ever disgraced the throne of an afflicted country. Cruel, crafty, and voluptuous, like his father, he was also, unlike him, weak in war and vacillating in peace. In him, as in so many characters which stand conspicuous on the stage of history, infidelity and superstition went hand in hand. But the morbid terrors of a guilty conscience did not save him from the criminal extravagances of a violent will. He was a man in whom were mingled the worst features of the Roman, the Oriental, and the Greek.

It was the policy of the numerous princelings who owed their very existence to Roman intervention, to pay frequent visits of ceremony to the Emperor at Rome. During one of these visits, possibly to condole with Tiberius on the death of his son Drusus, or his mother Livia, Antipas had been, while at Rome, the guest of his brother Herod Philip — not

the tetrarch of that name, but a son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, daughter of Simon the Boëthusian, who, having been disinherited by his father, was living at Rome as a private person.[1] Here he became entangled by the snares of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife; and he repaid the hospitality he had received by carrying her off. Everything combined to make the act as detestable as it was ungrateful and treacherous. The Herods carried intermarriage to an extent which only prevailed in the worst and most dissolute of the Oriental and post-Macedonian dynasties. Herodias being the daughter of Aristobulus, was not only the sister-in-law, but also the niece of Antipas;[2] she had already borne to her husband a daughter, who was now grown up. Antipas had himself long been married to the daughter of Aretas, or Hâreth, Emîr of Arabia, and neither he nor Herodias was young enough to plead even the poor excuse of youthful passion. The sole temptation on his side was an impotent sensuality; on hers an extravagant ambition. She preferred a marriage doubly adulterous and doubly incestuous to a life spent with the only Herod who could not boast even the fraction of a vice-regal throne. Antipas promised on his return from Rome to make her his wife, and she exacted from him a pledge that he would divorce his innocent consort, the daughter of the Arabian prince.

But "our pleasant vices," it has well been said, "are made the instruments to punish us;" and from this moment began for Herod Antipas a series of annoyances and misfortunes, which only culminated in his death years afterwards in discrowned royalty and unpitied exile. Herodias became from the first the evil genius of his house. The people were scandalized and outraged. Family dissensions were embittered. The Arabian princess, without waiting to be divorced, indignantly fled, first to the border castle of Machæ-

[1] A small fragment of the Stemma Herodum will make these relationships more clear.

HEROD THE GREAT

= Mariamne, d. of Simon. | = Malthace (a Samaritan). | = Cleopatra. | = Mariamne. d. of Hyrcanus.

Herod "Philip" = Herodias. | Salome.

Herod Antipas. = d. of Aretas. = Herodias.

Archelaus.

Philip, Tetr. of Iturea. = Salome.

Aristobulus. | Herodias. Herod Agrippa.

[2] Even the Romans regarded such unions with horror; and never got over the disgust which the Emperor Claudius caused them by marrying his niece Agrippina; but they were almost the rule in the Herodian family.

rus, and then to the rocky fastnesses of her father Hâreth at Petra. He, in his just indignation, broke off all amicable relations with his quondam son-in-law, and subsequently declared war against him, in which he avenged himself by the infliction of a severe and ruinous defeat.

Nor was this all. Sin was punished with sin, and the adulterous union had to be cemented with a prophet's blood. In the gay and gilded halls of any one of those sumptuous palaces which the Herods delighted to build, the dissolute tyrant may have succeeded perhaps in shutting out the deep murmur of his subjects' indignation; but there was one voice which reached him, and agitated his conscience, and would not be silenced. It was the voice of the great Baptist. How Herod had been thrown first into connection with him we do not know, but it was probably after he had seized possession of his person on the political plea that his teaching, and the crowds who flocked to him, tended to endanger the public safety.[1] Among other features in the character of Herod was a certain superstitious curiosity which led him to hanker after and tamper with the truths of the religion which his daily life so flagrantly violated. He summoned John to his presence. Like a new Elijah before another Ahab — clothed in his desert raiment, the hairy cloak and the leathern girdle — the stern and noble eremite stood fearless before the incestuous king. His words — the simple words of truth and justice — the calm reasoning about righteousness, temperance, and the judgment to come — fell like flakes of fire on that hard and icy conscience. Herod, alarmed perhaps by the fulfilment of the old curse of the Mosaic law in the childlessness of his union,[2] listened with some dim and feeble hope of future amendment. He even did many things gladly because of John. But there was *one* thing which he *would* not do — perhaps persuaded himself that he *could* not do — and that was, give up the guilty love which mastered him, or dismiss the haughty imperious woman who ruled his life after ruining his peace. "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife" was the blunt declaration of the dauntless Prophet; and though time after time he might be led over those splendid floors, pale and wasted with imprisonment and disappointed hope, yet, though

[1] So Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 5, § 2. In this way it is easy to reconcile his account with those of the Evangelists.

[2] Lev. xx. 21. We know how the same fact weighed on the mind of Henry VIII.

he well knew that it kindled against him an implacable enmity, and doomed him to a fresh remand to his solitary cell, he never hesitated to face the flushed and angry Herod with that great *Non licet*. Nor did he spare his stern judgment on all the other crimes and follies of Herod's life.[1] Other men — even men otherwise great and good — have had very smooth words for the sins of princes; but in the fiery soul of the Baptist, strengthened into noblest exercise by the long asceticism of the wilderness, there was no dread of human royalty and no compromise with exalted sin. And when courage and holiness and purity thus stood to rebuke the lustful meanness of a servile and corrupted soul, can we wonder if even among his glittering courtiers and reckless men-at-arms the king cowered conscience-stricken before the fettered prisoner?[2] But John knew how little trust can be placed in a soul that has been eaten away by a besetting sin; and since He to whom he had borne witness beyond Jordan wrought no miracle of power for his deliverance, it is not probable that he looked for any passage out of his dungeon in the Black Fortress,[3] save through the grave and gate of death.

Hitherto, indeed, the timidity or the scruples of Herod Antipas had afforded to John — so far as his mere life was concerned — a precarious protection from the concentrated venom of an adulteress's hate.[4] But at last what she had failed to gain by passionate influence she succeeded in gaining by subtle fraud. She knew well that even from his prison the voice of John might be more powerful than all the influences of her fading beauty, and might succeed at last in tearing from her forehead that guilty crown. But she watched her opportunity, and was not long in gaining her end.[5]

The Herodian princes, imitating the luxurious example of their great prototypes, the Roman emperors, were fond of

[1] Luke iii. 19.

[2] History has not seldom seen similar scenes repeated. Compare the instances of Theodosius and St. Ambrose, of Attila and Leo, of Thierry and St. Columban, of Heny II. and St. Thomas à Becket, of Henry IV. of Germany and Gregory VII., etc.

[3] So the Rabbis called Machærus. (Sepp.)

[4] "But Herodias was bitterly vehement against him (*ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ*; cf. Luke xi. 53), and had a settled wish to kill him; but she was not able. For Herod *was afraid* of John, knowing him to be a just and holy man, and *kept him safe*, and on hearing him used to do many things, and used to listen to him gladly" (Mark vi. 19, 20).

[5] The *γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαίρου* of Mark vi. 21 refers to the prearranged machinations of this Herodian Jezebel.

magnificent banquets and splendid anniversaries. Among others they had adopted the heathen fashion of birthday celebrations,[1] and Antipas on his birthday — apparently either at Machærus or at a neighboring palace called Julias — prepared a banquet for his courtiers, and generals, and Galilæan nobles. The wealth of the Herods, the expensive architecture of their numerous palaces, their universal tendency to extravagant display, make it certain that nothing would be wanting to such a banquet which wealth or royalty could procure; and there is enough to show that it was on the model of those

> "Sumptuous gluttonies and gorgeous feasts
> On citron table or Atlantic stone,"

which accorded with the depraved fashion of the Empire and mingled Roman *gourmandise* with Ionic sensuality. But Herodias had craftily provided the king with an unexpected and exciting pleasure, the spectacle of which would be sure to enrapture such guests as his. Dancers and dancing-women were at that time in great request.[2] The passion for witnessing these too often indecent and degrading representations had naturally made its way into the Sadducean and semi-pagan court of these usurping Edomites, and Herod the Great had built in his palace a theatre for the Thymelici.[3] A luxurious feast of the period was not regarded as complete unless it closed with some gross pantomimic representation; and doubtless Herod had adopted the evil fashion of his day. But he had not anticipated for his guests the rare luxury of seeing a princess — his own niece, a granddaughter of Herod the Great, and of Mariamne, a descendant, therefore, of Simon the High Priest, and the great line of Maccabæan princes — a princess who afterwards became the wife of a tetrarch and the mother of a king[4] — honoring them by degrading herself into a scenic dancer. And yet when the banquet was over, when the guests were full of meat and

[1] Gen. xl. 20; Herod. i. 133; Pers. *Sat.* v. 180. There can be little doubt that the unclassical γενέσια means a birthday celebration (cf. Jos. *Antt.* xii. 4, § 7). Wieseler labors with great ingenuity and learning to make it mean "accession festival" which was also kept by the Herods (*id. ib.*, xv. 11, § 6), but fails after all to adduce any other instance of the word used in this sense.

[2] Mnestor, Paris, etc. Cf. Jos. *Antt.* xii. 4, § 6.

[3] See Jos. *Antt.* xv. 8, § 1; xix. 7, § 5.

[4] She first married her uncle Philip, tetrarch of Ituræa, then her cousin Aristobulus, King of Chalcis, by whom she became mother of three sons. The Herodian princesses were famed for their beauty.

flushed with wine, Salome herself, the daughter of Herodias, then in the prime of her young and lustrous beauty, executed, as it would now be expressed, a *pas seul* "in the midst of"[1] those dissolute and half-intoxicated revellers. "She came in and danced, and pleased Herod, and them that sat at meat with him." And he, like another Xerxes,[2] in the delirium of his drunken approval, swore to this degraded girl, in the presence of his guests, that he would give her anything for which she asked, even to the half of his kingdom.[3]

The girl flew to her mother, and said, "What shall I ask?" It was exactly what Herodias expected, and she might have asked for robes, or jewels, or palaces, or whatever such a woman loves; but to a mind like hers revenge was sweeter than wealth or pride, and we may imagine with what fierce malice she hissed out the unhesitating answer, "The head of John the Baptizer." And coming in before the king *immediately with haste* — (what a touch is that! and how apt a pupil did the wicked mother find in her wicked daughter!) — Salome exclaimed, "My wish is that you give *me here*,[4] *immediately*, on a dish, the head of John the Baptist." Her indecent haste, her hideous petition, show that she shared the furies of her race. Did she think that in that infamous period, and among those infamous guests, her petition would be received with a burst of laughter? Did she hope to

[1] Matt. xiv. 6. In Mark vi. 22, ℵ, B, D, L read *αὐτοῦ*; but even if this were the true reading, the whole context would be sufficient to show that Keim is wrong (*Gesch. Jesu*, ii. 512) in charging St. Mark with the error of supposing that Salome was his *actual* daughter. As for the dance, Salome would but be imitating the ill-trained maidens of her own day —

> "Motus doceri gaudet Ionicos
> Matura virgo, et fingitur artibus
> Jam nunc et incestos amores
> De tenero meditatur ungui." (Hor. *Od.* iii. 6, 21.)

[2] Esth. v. 3; Herod. ix. 109. Cf. Suet. *Caius*, 32.

[3] There is a remarkable parallel to this narrative in the superb banquet given by Agrippa I. to the Emperor Caius, with the design of winning a favor. Caius showed his sense of the compliment paid to him by offering Agrippa anything which he liked to ask, and Agrippa used his opportunity nobly and unselfishly to dissuade Caius from the mad attempt to set up his statue in the Temple (Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 8, § 7). Caius says, *τὸ δὲ πᾶν ὅπερ σοι ῥοπὴν ἂν προσθείη τοῦ εὐδαίμονος, διακονήσεται σοι προθυμία τε καὶ ἰσχύϊ.* He expected Agrippa to ask for cities or lands, *ὁ δὲ καίπερ τὰ πάντα παρασκευασάμενος ἐφ' οἷς χρήσῃ οὐκ ἐφανέρου τὴν διάνοιαν.* Finally Caius grants the request, *ἅμα τῇ θεραπείᾳ τοῦ Ἀγρίππου ἐνειλημμένος, καὶ ἅμα ἀπρεπὲς ὑπολαμβάνων ἐπὶ τοσῶιδε μαρτύρων ψευδῆς γενέσθαι, κ. τ. λ.* The parallels seem almost too close to be purely accidental.

[4] *ὧδε* (Matt. xiv. 8); *ἐξαυτῆς* (Mark vi. 25). We might suppose that some scorn was intended by *τοῦ βαπτίζοντος*, "the man who baptizes," in verse 24, were it not that this seems to be the general form in St. Mark (i. 4; vi. 14).

kindle their merriment to a still higher pitch by the sense of the delightful wickedness[1] involved in a young and beautiful girl asking — nay, imperiously demanding — that then and there, on one of the golden dishes which graced the board, should be given into her own hands the gory head of the Prophet whose words had made a thousand bold hearts quail?

If so, she was disappointed. The tetrarch, at any rate, was plunged into grief by her request;[2] it more than did away with the pleasure of her disgraceful dance; it was a bitter termination of his birthday feast. Fear, policy, remorse, superstition, even whatever poor spark of better feeling remained unquenched under the dense white ashes of a heart consumed by evil passions, all made him shrink in disgust from this sudden execution. He must have felt that he had been egregiously duped out of his own will by the cunning stratagem of his unrelenting paramour. If a single touch of manliness had been left in him he would have repudiated the request as one which did not fall either under the letter or the spirit of his oath, since the life of one cannot be made the gift to another; or he would have boldly declared at once that if such was her choice, his oath was more honored by being broken than by being kept. But a despicable pride and fear of man prevailed over his better impulses. More afraid of the criticisms of his guests than of the future torment of such conscience as was left him, he immediately sent an executioner to the prison, which in all probability was not far from the banqueting hall; and so, at the bidding of a dissolute coward, and to please the loathly fancies of a shameless girl, the axe fell, and the head of the noblest of the prophets was shorn away.

In darkness and in secrecy the scene was enacted, and if any saw it their lips were sealed; but the executioner emerged into the light carrying by the hair that noble head, and then and there, in all the ghastliness of recent death, it was placed upon a dish from the royal table. The young dancing girl received it,[3] and now frightful as a Megæra,

[1] "Quasi volesse crescere l'allegrezza di quel convito con un gran delitto" (Capecellatro, *La Vita di Gesù*, ii. 11). Volkmar thinks that she was a mere child, the unconscious instrument in her mother's hands; and that the ἐὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς of Mark vi. 25 implies mere ignorant girlish glee.

[2] St. Mark (vi. 26) uses the strong expression, περίλυπος γενόμενος.

[3] This bad age produced more than one parallel to such awful and sanguinary *nonchalance* on the part of women nobly born. Fulvia again and again ran a golden needle through the tongue of Cicero's dissevered

carried the hideous burden to her mother. Let us hope that the awful spectacle haunted the souls of both thenceforth till death.

What became of that ghastly relic we do not know. Tradition tells us that Herodias ordered the headless trunk [1] to be flung out over the battlements for dogs and vultures to devour. On her, at any rate, swift vengeance fell.

The disciples of John — perhaps Manaen the Essene,[2] the foster-brother of Herod Antipas, may have been among them — took up the corpse, and buried it. Their next care was to go and tell Jesus, some of them, it may be, with sore and bitter hearts, that His friend and Forerunner — the first who had borne witness to Him, and over whom He had Himself pronounced so great an eulogy — was dead.

And about the same time His Apostles also returned from their mission, and told Him all that they had done and taught. They had preached repentance; they had cast out devils; they had anointed the sick with oil, and healed them.[3] But the record of their ministry is very brief, and not very joyous. In spite of partial successes, it seemed as if their untried faith had as yet proved inadequate for the high task imposed on them.

And very shortly afterwards another piece of intelligence reached Jesus; it was that the murderous tetrarch was inquiring about Him; wished to see Him; perhaps would send and demand His presence when he returned to his new palace, the Golden House of his new capital at Tiberias. For the mission of the Twelve had tended more than ever to

head; and Agrippina similarly outraged the head of her rival, Lollia Paulina (Dio Cass. xlvii. 9; lx. 33). It is sad to know that decapitation was regarded by the Jews with very special horror (*Sanhedr.* 7, 3). (Wetstein, *ad loc.*)

[1] πτῶμα (Mark vi. 29). The tradition is mentioned by S. Jerome (*c. Ruffinum* iii. 42) and Nicephorus (i. 19). For the traditional death of "the dancing daughter of Herodias," by falling through, and having her head cut off by the ice, see Niceph. i. 20. He reports that "passing over a frozen lake, the ice broke, and she fell up to the neck in water, and her head was parted from her body by the violence of the fragments shaken by the water and her own fall, and so perished, God having fitted a judgment to the analogy and representment of her sin" (Jer. Taylor, *Life of Christ*, II. 10). But history loses sight of Salome in the court of her second husband, Aristobulus (Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 5, § 4), and since God's judgments are not always displayed in this life, she may, for all we really know, have died, like Lucrezia Borgia, in the odor of sanctity at her little court.

[2] Perhaps this Manaen (see Acts xiii. 1; Jos. *Antt.* xv. 10, § 5) was a son of the Manaen who foretold to Herod the Great his future dignity.

[3] Cf. James v. 14.

spread a rumor of Him among the people,[1] and speculation respecting Him was rife. All admitted that He had some high claim to attention. Some thought that He was Elijah, some Jeremiah, others one of the Prophets; but Herod had the most singular solution of the problem. It is said that when Theodoric had ordered the murder of Symmachus, he was haunted and finally maddened by the phantom of the old man's distorted features glaring at him from a dish on the table; nor can it have been otherwise with Herod Antipas. Into his banquet hall had been brought the head of one whom, in the depth of his inmost being, he felt to have been holy and just; and he had seen, with the solemn agony of death still resting on them, the stern features on which he had often gazed with awe. Did no reproach issue from those dead lips yet louder and more terrible than they had spoken in life? were the accents which had uttered, "It is not lawful for thee to have her," frozen into silence, or did they seem to issue with supernatural energy from the mute ghastliness of death? If we mistake not, that dissevered head was rarely thenceforth absent from Herod's haunted imagination from that day forward till he lay upon his dying bed. And now, when but a brief time afterwards, he heard of the fame of another Prophet — of a Prophet transcendently mightier, and one who wrought miracles, which John had *never* done — his guilty conscience shivered with superstitious dread, and to his intimates[2] he began to whisper with horror, "*This is John the Baptist, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead*, and therefore these mighty works are wrought by him."[3] Had John sprung to life again thus suddenly to inflict a signal vengeance? would he come to the strong towers of Machærus at the head of a multitude in wild revolt? or glide through the gilded halls of Julias or Tiberias, terrible, at midnight, with ghostly tread? "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?"

As the imperious and violent temper of Herodias was the

[1] Mark vi. 14.

[2] Τοῖς παισίν αὐτοῦ (Matt. xiv. 2). The Hebrew עֲבָדִים means more than "servants," and hence is rendered by παῖς and φίλος in the LXX., and in Symmachus (1 Sam. xviii. 22; Esth. ii. 18), as well as by δοῦλος (Kuinoel, *ad Cor.*). This terrified surmise of the palace may have been mentioned by Chuza or Manaen.

[3] Matt. xiv. 2; Mark vi. 16. That such thoughts must have been very rife is shown by the fact that when the army of Herod Antipas was disgracefully routed by Aretas, the people looked on it as a retribution for the murder of John (Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 5, §§ 1, 2).

constant scourge of her husband's peace, so her mad ambition was subsequently the direct cause of his ruin. When the Emperor Caius (Caligula) began to heap favors on Herod Agrippa I., Herodias, sick with envy and discontent, urged Antipas to sail with her to Rome, and procure a share of the distinction which had thus been given to her brother. Above all, she was anxious that her husband should obtain the title of king,[1] instead of continuing content with the humbler one of tetrarch. In vain did the timid and ease-loving Antipas point out to her the danger to which he might be exposed by such a request. She made his life so bitter to him by her importunity that, against his better judgment, he was forced to yield. The event justified his worst misgivings. No love reigned between the numerous uncles and nephews and half-brothers in the tangled family of Herod, and either out of policy or jealousy Agrippa not only discountenanced the schemes of his sister and uncle — though they had helped him in his own misfortunes — but actually sent his freedman Fortunatus to Rome to accuse Antipas of treasonable designs. The tetrarch failed to clear himself of the charge, and in A.D. 39 was banished to Lugdunum — probably St. Bertrand de Comminges, in Gaul, not far from the Spanish frontier.[2] Herodias, either from choice or necessity or despair, accompanied his exile, and here they both died in obscurity and dishonor. Salome, the dancer — the Lucrezia Borgia of the Herodian house — disappears henceforth from history. Tradition or legend alone informs us that she met with an early, violent, and hideous death.

[1] He is called *βασιλεὺς* in Mark vi. 14 (and the courtesy title was common enough in the provinces), but *τετράρχης* more accurately in Matt. xiv. 1; Luke ix. 7.

[2] "Thus," says Josephus (*Antt.* xviii. 7, § 2), "did God punish Herodias for her envy at her brother, and Herod for lending an ear to empty feminine talk." He adds that when Caius learnt that Herodias was a sister of Agrippa, he would have shown her some favor; but the passion with which she rejected it made him banish her also.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND, AND WALKING ON THE SEA.

"Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known." — Ps. lxxvii. 19.

The Feeding of the Five Thousand is one of the few miracles during the ministry of Christ which are narrated to us by all four of the Evangelists;[1] and as it is placed by St. John after the nameless festival and just before a Passover, and by the Synoptists in immediate connection with the return of the Twelve and the execution of the Baptist, we can hardly err in introducing it at this point of our narrative.

The novel journeyings of the Apostles, the agitation of His own recent conflicts, the burden of that dread intelligence which had just reached Him, the constant pressure of a fluctuating multitude which absorbed all their time, once more rendered it necessary that the little company should

[1] Matt. xiv. 13–33; Mark vi. 30–52; Luke ix. 10–17; John vi. 1–21. The reader will find every incident of the text either directly stated or clearly implied in one or other of these quadruple narratives. In every important particular they show the most absolute unanimity; the trifling divergences, which a captious and ungenerous criticism delights to exaggerate into glaring discrepancies, are perfectly reconcilable without any violent hypothesis, and are all more or less accounted for in the story as here given. "The notion that genuine history is characterized by an exact and minute attention to details," says a recent writer, "is wholly modern. It may be doubted whether, since no narrative can give all particulars, this method of historical composition does not, with all the affectation of reality, present a more unreal presentation of the past than the artless tale of an interested but uncritical observer — whether, in short, syncretic history is not apt to be exceedingly untrustworthy or deceptive. The more accurately two persons relate their impressions of the same great events, the wider is sure to be the discrepancy between them. No two men see facts in exactly the same light, or direct their attention to exactly the same circumstances" (*Paul of Tarsus*, p. 154). He adds that, exact and patient as Thucydides is, we should have possessed two widely differing stories of the Peloponnesian war if another observer equally critical had devoted his attention to the same events. These slight divergences of the Gospels serve, however, to establish in the most satisfactory manner the essential independence of the fourfold testimonies. They may tell against exaggerated, superstitious, and anti-scriptural theories of Inspiration; but they are demonstrably compatible with the most perfect truthfulness and honesty.

recover the tone and bloom of their spirits by a brief period of rest and solitude. "Come ye yourselves," He said, "apart into a desert place, and rest awhile."

At the northeastern corner of the Lake, a little beyond the point where the Jordan enters it, was a second Bethsaida, or "Fish-house,"[1] once, like its western namesake, a small village, but recently enlarged and beautified by Philip, tetrarch of Ituræa, and called, for the sake of distinction, Bethsaida Julias.[2] The second name had been given it in honor of Julia, the beautiful but infamous daughter of the Emperor Augustus. These half-heathen Herodian cities, with their imitative Greek architecture and adulatory Roman names, seem to have repelled rather than attracted the feet of Christ; and though much of His work was accomplished in the neighborhood of considerable cities, we know of no city except Jerusalem in which He ever taught. But to the south of Bethsaida Julias was the green and narrow plain of El Batîhah, which, like the hills that close it round, was uninhabited then as now. Hitherward the little vessel steered its course, with its freight of weary and saddened hearts which sought repose. But private as the departure had been, it had not passed unobserved, and did not remain unknown.[3] It is but six miles by sea from Capernaum to the retired and desolate shore which was their destination. The little vessel, evidently retarded by unfavorable winds, made its way slowly at no great distance from the shore, and by the time it reached its destination, the object which their Master's kindness had desired for His Apostles was completely frustrated. Some of the multitude had already outrun the vessel, and were thronging about the landing-place when the prow touched the pebbly shore; while in the distance were seen the thronging groups of Passover pilgrims, who were attracted out of their course by the increasing celebrity of this Unknown Prophet.[4] Jesus was touched with compassion for them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd. We may conjecture from St. John that on reaching the land He and His disciples climbed the hillside, and there waited a short time till the whole multitude had as-

[1] בֵּית צַיְדָה. The same root is found in the name *Sidon*.

[2] Jos. *Antt.* xviii. 2, § 1; *B. J.* iii. 10, § 7; Plin. *Hist. Nat.* v. 15, "In lacum se fundit, quam plures Genezaram vocant, xvi. mill. pass. longitudinis, vi. mill. lat. amoenis circumseptum oppidis, ab oriente, *Juliade*," etc.

[3] Mark vi. 33, *εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας*; Luke ix. 11, *γνόντες*; Matt. xiv. 13, *ἀκούσαντες*.

[4] Mark vi. 33; John vi. 2, 4.

sembled. Then descending among them He taught them many things, preaching to them of the kingdom of heaven, and healing their sick.[1]

The day wore on; already the sun was sinking towards the western hills,[2] yet still the multitude lingered, charmed by that healing voice and by those holy words. The evening would soon come, and after the brief Oriental twilight, the wandering crowd, who in their excitement had neglected even the necessities of life, would find themselves in the darkness, hungry and afar from every human habitation. The disciples began to be anxious lest the day should end in some unhappy catastrophe, which would give a fresh handle to the already embittered enemies of their Lord. But His compassion had already forestalled their considerable anxiety, and had suggested the difficulty to the mind of Philip.[3] A little consultation took place. To buy even a mouthful apiece for such a multitude would require at least two hundred denarii (more than £7); and even supposing that they possessed such a sum in their common purse, there was now neither time nor opportunity to make the necessary purchases. Andrew hereupon mentioned that there was a little boy there who had five barley-loaves and two small fishes, but he only said it in a despairing way, and, as it were, to show the utter helplessness of the only suggestion which occurred to him.[4]

[1] "The sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel," says Mr. Bruce, "is full of marvels; it tells of a great miracle, a great enthusiasm, a great storm, a great sermon, a great apostasy, and great trial of faith and fidelity endured by the Twelve" (*Training of the Twelve*, p. 120).

[2] The ὀψία of Matt. xiv. 15 means the δείλη ὀψία or afternoon; the ὀψία of verse 23 is the second or later evening, after six o'clock.

[3] Why He should have tested the faith of Philip in particular is not mentioned; it is simply one of the unexplained touches which always occur in the narratives of witnesses familiar with their subject. Prof. Blunt, in his interesting *Undesigned Coincidences*, suggests that it was because "Philip was of Bethsaida;" this can have nothing to do with it, for Philip's native village (now Ain et-Tâbijah) was at the opposite side of the Lake. Reland's discovery (*Palaest.*, p. 564) that there were *two* Bethsaidas (one, Bethsaida Julias, at the north end of the Lake, and the other a fishing village on its western side) solves all the difficulties of Luke ix. 10 (where, however, the Cod. Sinaiticus, and the Nitrian recension of the Syriac edited by Cureton, omit the allusion to Bethsaida), Mark vi. 45, etc. (See Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, ii. 413; Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.*, p. 382, etc.)

[4] If this παιδάριον (John vi. 9) was, as may be inferred from Mark vi. 38, *in attendance upon the Apostles*, it is very likely that he too, like Philip and Andrew, was a native of the western Bethsaida; and then perhaps our Lord's question may have been meant to see whether the simple-hearted Philip had faith enough to mention this possible resource. The ἓν is probably spurious; it is not found in ℵ, B, D, L.

"Make the men sit down," was the brief reply.

Wondering and expectant, the Apostles bade the multitude recline, as for a meal, on the rich green grass which in that pleasant spring-time clothed the hillsides. They arranged them in companies of fifty and a hundred, and as they sat in these orderly groups upon the grass, the gay red and blue and yellow colors of the clothing which the poorest Orientals wear, called up in the imagination of St. Peter a multitude of flower-beds in some well-cultivated garden.[1] And then, standing in the midst of His guests — glad-hearted at the work of mercy which He intended to perform — Jesus raised His eyes to heaven, gave thanks,[2] blessed the loaves,[3] broke them into pieces, and began to distribute them[4] to His disciples, and they to the multitude; and the two fishes He divided among them all. It was a humble but a sufficient, and to hungry wayfarers a delicious meal. And when all were abundantly satisfied, Jesus, not only to show His disciples the extent and reality of what had been done, but also to teach them the memorable lesson that wastefulness, even of miraculous power, is wholly alien to the Divine economy, bade them gather up the fragments that remained, that nothing might be lost. The symmetrical arrangement of the multitude showed that about five thousand men, besides women and children, had been fed,[5] and yet twelve baskets[6] were filled with what was over and above to them that had eaten.

[1] ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, "they reclined *in parterres*" (*arevlatim*), is the picturesque expression of St. Mark (vi. 40), who here, as throughout his Gospel, doubtless reflects the impressions of St. Peter. The word πρασιαὶ occurs here only, but Theophylact's definition of it (*ad loc.*) is exactly that of a parterre (τὰ ἐν τοῖς κήποις διάφορα κόμματα ἐν οἷς φυτεύονται διάφορα . . . λάχανα). The συμπόσια συμπόσια of the previous verse describes the orderly social grouping, *catervatim*. The words are repeated by a Hebraism, which is, however, in accordance with simple Greek idiom (cf. μύρια μύρια, Æsch. *Pers.* 981; Winer, *New Test. Gram.*, p. 264, sixth edition, E. Tr.). Lightfoot compares the Hebrew שורות שורות used to describe the quincuncial order of vines, and of pupils in *a kerem* or "vineyard," *i.e.* school.

[2] John vi. 11, εὐχαριστήσας.

[3] Luke ix. 16, εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς.

[4] κατέκλισε . . . καὶ ἰδίδου (Mark vi. 41). The aorist implies the instantaneous — the imperfect, the continuous act. The fact is interesting, as giving us the only glimpse permitted us of the mode in which the miracle was wrought. The multiplication of the loaves and fishes evidently took place in the hands of Christ between the acts of breaking and of distributing the bread.

[5] Women and children would not sit down with the men, but sit or stand apart. Probably in that lonely and distant spot their numbers would not be great.

[6] It has been repeatedly noticed that all the Evangelists alike here use κόφινοι for the common *wicker-baskets* (ἀγγεῖον πλεκτόν, Suid., perhaps corre-

The miracle produced a profound impression. It was exactly in accordance with the current expectation, and the multitude began to whisper to each other that this must undoubtedly be "that Prophet which should come into the world;" the Shiloh of Jacob's blessing; the Star and the Sceptre of Balaam's vision; the Prophet like unto Moses to whom they were to hearken; perhaps the Elijah promised by the dying breath of ancient prophecy;[1] perhaps the Jeremiah of their tradition, come back to reveal the hiding-place of the Ark, and the Urim, and the sacred fire. Jesus marked their undisguised admiration, and the danger that their enthusiasm might break out by force, and precipitate His death by open rebellion against the Roman government in the attempt to make Him a king. He saw too that His disciples seemed to share this worldly and perilous excitement. The time was come, therefore, for instant action. By the exercise of direct authority, He compelled[2] His disciples to embark in their boat, and cross the lake before Him in the direction of Capernaum or the western Bethsaida.[3] A little gentle constraint was necessary, for they were naturally unwilling to leave Him among the excited multitude on that lonely shore, and if anything great was going to happen to Him they felt a right to be present. On

sponding to the Hebrew *salsillôth*, Jer. vi. 9) in which these fragments were collected; and the word σπυρίδες, or "rope-baskets," when they speak of the feeding of the four thousand. If any one thinks it important to ask where the κοφίνοι came from, the answer is that they were the very commonest possession of Jews, who constantly used them to prevent their food, etc., from being polluted. "Judaeis, quorum *cophinus* fenumque supellex" (Juv., *Sat.* iii. 14; cf. vi. 542). Even in Palestine, overrun as it was at this period with heathens, such a precaution might be necessary. There was a Jewish festival named *Cophinus* (Sidonius, *Ep.* vii. 6, quoted by Mr. Mayor on Juv. *l. c.*).

[1] Gen. xlix. 10; Numb. xxiv. 17; Deut. xviii. 15, 18; Mal. iv. 5. I adopt the current Jewish explanations.

[2] ἠνάγκασε (Matthew, Mark). How unintelligible would this word be but for the fact mentioned by John vi. 15; how clear does it become when the fact there mentioned is before us; and again how imperfect would be our comprehension of what took place if we had the narrative of John alone.

[3] Compare Mark vi. 45 with John vi. 17. Tell Hûm (Capernaum) and Bethsaida (Ain et-Tâbijah) are so near together that they might make for either as was most convenient, and indeed, since the landing-place at Bethsaida was the more convenient of the two, it might be considered as the harbor of Capernaum. On the other hand, the hypothesis of Thomson and others that there was only one Bethsaida (viz., Julias) falls to the ground if we compare Mark vi. 45 ("*unto the other side*, towards Bethsaida") with Luke ix. 10, which shows that they were already at Bethsaida Julias — except, indeed, on the unlikely and far-fetched notion (adopted by Wieseler, *Chron. Syn.*, p. 249; Lange, *Life of Christ*, iii. 138) that their plan was to coast along, touch at Bethsaida Julias, there take up our Lord, and then proceed to the other Bethsaida.

the other hand, it was more easy for Him to dismiss the multitude when they had seen that His own immediate friends and disciples had been sent away.

So in the gathering dusk He gradually and gently succeeded in persuading the multitude to leave Him,[1] and when all but the most enthusiastic had streamed away to their homes or caravans, He suddenly left the rest, and fled from them[2] to the hill-top alone to pray. He was conscious that a solemn and awful crisis of His day on earth was come, and by communing with His Heavenly Father, He would nerve His soul for the stern work of the morrow, and the bitter conflict of many coming weeks. Once before he had spent in the mountain solitudes a night of lonely prayer, but then it was before the choice of His beloved Apostles, and the glad tidings of His earliest and happiest ministry. Far different were the feelings with which the Great High Priest now climbed the rocky stairs of that great mountain altar which in His temple of the night seemed to lift Him nearer to the stars of God. The murder of His beloved Forerunner brought home to His soul more nearly the thought of death; nor was He deceived by this brief blaze of a falsely founded popularity, which on the next day he meant to quench. The storm which now began to sweep over the barren hills; the winds that rushed howling down the ravines; the lake before Him buffeted into tempestuous foam; the little boat which — as the moonlight struggled through the rifted clouds — He saw tossing beneath Him on the laboring waves, were all too sure an emblem of the altered aspect of His earthly life. But there on the desolate hill-top, in that night of storm, He could gain strength and peace and happiness unspeakable; for there He was alone with God. And so over that figure, bowed in lonely prayer upon the hills, and over those toilers upon the troubled lake, the darkness fell and the great winds blew.[3]

Hour after hour passed by. It was now the fourth watch of the night;[4] the ship had traversed but half of its des-

[1] Mark vi. 45, *ἀπολύει*, contrasted with the aorist *ἀπόλυσον* in verse 36.

[2] That some lingered, we infer from John vi. 22. I have adopted the reading *φεύγει* in John vi. 15, with ℵ and the Vulgate, instead of *ἀνεχώρησεν*. The narrative gives the impression that the excitement of the multitude, and the necessity for exertion on the part of Jesus, were greater than is fully told. But even the received reading, *ἀνεχώρησεν*, involves the same conception. (Cf. Matt. ii. 12, 22.)

[3] John vi. 17, 18, *κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς ἡ σκοτία.* (ℵ, D.)

[4] Between three and six; the Jews at this time had mainly given up their own division of the night into three watches (Judg. vii. 19), and

tined course; it was dark, and the wind was contrary, and the waves boisterous, and they were distressed with toiling at the oar,[1] and above all there was no one with them now to calm and save, for Jesus was alone upon the land. Alone upon the land, and they were tossing on the perilous sea; but all the while He saw and pitied them, and at last, in their worst extremity, they saw a gleam in the darkness, and an awful figure, and a fluttering robe, and One drew near them, treading upon the ridges of the sea,[2] but seemed as if He meant to pass them by; and they cried out in terror at the sight, thinking that it was a phantom[3] that walked upon the waves. And through the storm and darkness to them — as so often to us, when, amid the darknesses of life, the ocean seems so great, and our little boats so small — there thrilled that Voice of peace, which said, "It is I: be not afraid."

That Voice stilled their terrors, and at once they were eager to receive Him into the ship;[4] but Peter's impetuous love — the strong yearning of him who, in his despairing self-consciousness, had cried out, "Depart from me!" — now cannot even await His approach, and he passionately exclaims —

"Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water."

"Come."

And over the vessel's side into the troubled waves he sprang, and while his eye was fixed on his Lord, the wind might toss his hair, and the spray might drench his robes, but all was well; but when, with wavering faith, he glanced from Him to the furious waves, and to the gulfy blackness

adopted the four Roman watches between six P.M. and six A.M. They had only rowed twenty-five furlongs, and the lake is about forty wide (Jos. *B. J.* iii. 10, § 7).

[1] Mark vi. 48, *ἰδὼν αὐτοὺς βασανιζομενους ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν* — a very strong expression. Some see a difficulty in John vi. 17, "and Jesus had not come to them," and indeed it furnishes the chief ground for the suggestion that He had designed to join them at or near Bethsaida Julias; but surely it may be merely proleptic (He had not *yet* come, as He did immediately afterwards), involving perhaps in the mind of the Evangelist the silent thought that "man's *extremity* is God's opportunity." *οὔπω* is indeed the actual reading of ℵ, B, D, L, but even *οὐκ* would be quite in accordance with St. John's manner.

[2] Job ix. 8.

[3] Mark vi. 49, *φάντασμα*, a mere unsubstantial appearance; *τὸ μὴ ὂν ἀληθεῖ ἀλλὰ σχήματι* (Hesych.). Cf. Luke xxiv. 37.

[4] John vi. 21, *ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν* — *i.e.*, they wished to do so, and of course did. Cf. *θέλετε ποιεῖν* (John viii. 44).

underneath, then he began to sink,[1] and in an accent of despair — how unlike his former confidence! — he faintly cried, "Lord, save me!"[2] Nor did Jesus fail. Instantly, with a smile of pity, He stretched out His hand, and grasped the hand of His drowning disciple, with the gentle rebuke, "O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?" And so, his love satisfied, but his over-confidence rebuked, they climbed — the Lord and His abashed Apostle — into the boat; and the wind lulled, and amid the ripple of waves upon a moonlit shore, they were at the haven where they would be; and all — the crew as well as His disciples — were filled with deeper and deeper amazement, and some of them, addressing Him by a title which Nathanael alone had applied to Him before, exclaimed, "Truly thou art the Son of God."

Let us pause a moment longer over this wonderful narrative, perhaps of all others the most difficult for our feeble faith to believe or understand. Some have tried in various methods to explain away its miraculous character; they have labored to show that ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν[3] may mean no more than that Jesus walked along the shore parallel to the vessel; or even that, in the darkness, the Apostles may have thought at first that He was, or had been, walking upon the sea. Such subterfuges are idle and superfluous. If any man find himself unable to believe in miracles — if he even think it wrong to try and acquire the faith which accepts them — then let him be thoroughly convinced in his own mind, and cling honestly to the truth as he conceives it. It is not for us, or for any man, to judge another; to his own Master he standeth or falleth. But let him not attempt to foist such disbelief into the plain narrative of the Evangelists. That *they intended* to describe an amazing miracle is indisputable to any one who carefully reads their words; and, as I have said before, if, believing in God, we believe in a Divine Providence over the lives of men — and, believing in that Divine Providence, believe in the miraculous — and, believing in the miraculous, accept as truth the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ — and, believing that resurrection,

[1] How unlike forgery, or falsehood, or myth, is this!

[2] "In this moment of peril," as Archbishop Trench strikingly observes, "his swimmer's art (John xxi. 7) profits him nothing; for there is no mingling in this way of nature and grace" (*On the Miracles*, p. 299). Cf. Ps. xciv. 18.

[3] John vi. 15. Perhaps the better reading (as in the other Gospels) is ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, which has the high authority of ℵ, B, C, D.

believe that He was indeed the Son of God — then, however deeply we may realize the beauty and the wonder and the power of natural laws, we realize yet more deeply the power of Him who holds those laws, and all which they have evolved, in the hollow of His hand; and to us the miraculous, when thus attested, will be in no way more stupendous than the natural, nor shall we find it an impossible conception that He who sent His Son to earth to die for us should have put all authority into His hand.

So then if, like Peter, we fix our eyes on Jesus, we too may walk triumphantly over the swelling waves of disbelief, and unterrified amid the rising winds of doubt; but if we turn away our eyes from Him in whom we have believed — if, as it is so easy to do, and as we are so much tempted to do, we look rather at the power and fury of those terrible and destructive elements than at Him who can help and save — then we too shall inevitably sink. Oh, if we feel, often and often, that the water-floods threaten to drown us, and the deep to swallow up the tossed vessel of our Church and Faith, may it again and again be granted us to hear amid the storm and the darkness, and the voices prophesying war, those two sweetest of the Saviour's utterances —

"Fear not. Only believe."

"It is I. Be not afraid."

CHAPTER XXX.

THE DISCOURSE AT CAPERNAUM.

"Gratia ejus non consumitur morsibus." — AUGUSTINE.

THE dawn of that day broke on one of the saddest episodes of our Saviour's life. It was the day in the synagogue at Capernaum on which He deliberately scattered the mists and exhalations of such spurious popularity as the Miracle of the Loaves had gathered about His person and His work, and put not only His idle followers, but some even of His nearer disciples to a test under which their love for Him entirely failed. That discourse in the synagogue forms a marked crisis in His career. It was followed by manifestations of surprised dislike which were as the first mutterings of that storm of hatred and persecution which was henceforth to burst over His head.

We have seen already that some of the multitude, filled with vague wonder and insatiable curiosity, had lingered on the little plain by Bethsaida Julias that they might follow the movements of Jesus, and share in the blessings and triumphs of which they expected an immediate manifestation. They had seen Him dismiss His disciples, and had perhaps caught glimpses of Him as He climbed the hill alone; they had observed that the wind was contrary, and that no other boat but that of the Apostles had left the shore; they made sure, therefore, of finding Him somewhere on the hills above the plain. Yet when the morning dawned they saw no trace of Him either on plain or hill. Meanwhile some little boats — perhaps driven across by the same gale which had retarded the opposite course of the disciples[1] — had arrived from Tiberias. They availed themselves of these to cross over to Capernaum; and there, already in the early morning, they found Him after all the fatigues and agitations of yesterday — after the day of sad tidings and ceaseless toil, after the night of stormy solitude and cease-

[1] Blunt, *Undes. Coincidences*, p. 292.

CAPERNAUM.

less prayer — calmly seated, and calmly teaching, in the familiar synagogue.[1]

"Rabbi, when didst thou get hither?" is the expression of their natural surprise; but it is met with perfect silence. The miracle of walking on the water was one of necessity and mercy; it in no way concerned them; it was not in any way intended for them; nor was it mainly or essentially as a worker of miracles that Christ wished to claim their allegiance or convince their minds. And, therefore, reading their hearts, knowing that they were seeking Him in the very spirit which He most disliked, He quietly drew aside the veil of perhaps half-unconscious hypocrisy which hid them from themselves, and reproached them for seeking Him only for what they could get from Him — "not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves and were satisfied." He who never rejected the cry of the sufferer, or refused to answer the question of the faithful — He who would never break the bruised reed, or quench the smoking flax — at once rejected the false eye-service of mean self-interest and vulgar curiosity. Yet He added for their sakes the eternal lesson, "Labor ye not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which remaineth to eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give you; for Him the Father — even God — hath sealed."

It seems as if at first they were touched and ashamed. He had read their hearts aright, and they ask Him, "What are we to do that we may work the works of God?"

"*This* is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." "But what *sign* would Jesus give them that they should believe in Him? Their fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, which David had called bread from heaven."[2] The inference was obvious. Moses had given them manna from heaven; Jesus as yet — they hinted — had only given them barley-loaves of earth. But if He were the true Messiah, was He not, according to all the legends of their nation, to enrich and crown them, and to banquet them on pomegranates from Eden, and "a vineyard of red wine," and upon the flesh of Behemoth and Leviathan, and the great bird Bar Juchne?[3] Might not the very psalm

[1] And even this teaching must have been preceded by works of healing if Matt. xiv. 34–36 be in strictly chronological sequence; but a comparison of these verses with Mark vi. 53–56, would seem to show that they refer more to a period than to a particular day.

[2] Ps. lxxviii. 24.

[3] For the Rabbinical dreams on this subject, see Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.*,

which they had quoted have taught them how worse than useless it would have been if Jesus had given them manna, which, in their coarse literalism, they supposed to be in reality angels' food? Is not David in that psalm expressly showing that to grant them one such blessing was only to make them ask greedily for more, and that if God had given their fathers more, it was only because "they believed not in God, and put not their trust in His help;" but "while the meat was yet in their mouths, the heavy wrath of God came upon them, and slew the mightiest of them, and smote down the chosen men that were in Israel"? And does not David show that in spite of, and before, and after, this wrathful granting to them to the full of their own hearts' lusts, so far from believing and being humble, they only sinned yet more and more against Him, and provoked Him more and more? Had not all the past history of their nation proved decisively that faith must rest on deeper foundations than signs and miracles, and that the evil heart of unbelief must be stirred by nobler emotions than astonishment at the outstretched hand and the mighty arm?

But Jesus led them at once to loftier regions than those of historical conviction. He tells them that He who had given them the manna was not Moses, but God; and that the manna was only in poetic metaphor bread from heaven; but that His Father, the true giver, was giving them the true bread from heaven even now — even the bread of God which came down from heaven, and was giving life to the world.[1]

Their minds still fastened to mere material images — their hopes still running on mere material benefits — they ask for this bread from heaven as eagerly as the woman of Samaria had asked for the water which quenches all thirst. "Lord, now and always give *us* this bread."

Jesus said to them, "I am the bread of life. He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst;" and He proceeds to point out to them that He came to do the Father's will, and that His will was that all who came to His Son should have eternal life.

Then the old angry murmurs burst out again — not this

cap. 50; Bartolocci, *Bibl. Rabb.* i. 511–514; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, p. 552. On the manna which was supposed to "serve to the appetite of the eater, and temper itself to every man's liking," see Wisd. xvi. 20, 21.

[1] "The bread of God is *that* which cometh down," etc., not "*he*," as in the English version.

time from the vulgar-minded multitude, but from His old opponents the leading Jews[1] — "How could He say that He came down from heaven? How could He call Himself the bread of life? Was He not Jesus, the son of Joseph, the carpenter of Nazareth?"

Jesus never met these murmurs about His supposed parentage and place of birth by revealing to the common crowds the high mystery of His earthly origin. He thought not equality with God a thing to be seized by Him. He was in no hurry to claim His own Divinity, or demand the homage which was its due. He would let the splendor of His Divine nature dawn on men gradually, not at first in all its noonday brightness, but gently as the light of morning through His word and works. In the fullest and deepest sense "*He emptied Himself of His glory.*"[2]

But He met the murmurers, as He always did, by a stronger, fuller, clearer declaration of the very truth which they rejected. It was thus that He had dealt with Nicodemus; it was thus that He had taught the woman of Samaria; it was thus also that He answered the Temple doctors who arraigned His infringement of their sabbatic rules. But the timid Rabbi and the erring woman had been faithful enough and earnest enough to look deeper into His words and humbly seek their meaning, and so to be guided into truth. Not so with these listeners. God had drawn them to Christ, and they had rejected His gracious drawing without which they *could* not come. When Jesus reminded them that the manna was no life-giving substance, since their fathers had eaten thereof and were dead, but that He was Himself the bread of life, of which all who eat should live forever; and when, in language yet more startling, He added that the bread was *His flesh* which He would give for the life of the world — then, instead of seeking the true significance of that deep metaphor, they made it a matter of mere verbal criticism, and only wrangled[3] together about the idle question, "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?"

Thus they were carnally-minded, and to be carnally-minded

[1] John vi. 41, 52, οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι.

[2] See some striking remarks in Lynch's *Mornington Lectures*, p. 171.

[3] ἐμάχοντο (John vi. 52). How needless their literalism was may be seen from many Rabbinic passages in Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr.* ad loc., pp. 553, 554) (and comp. Ps. xix. 10; cxix. 3; Isa. iii. 1; Prov. ix. 5; Ezek. ii. 8, 9, etc.), *e.g.*, "Every eating and drinking in the book of Ecclesiastes is to be understood of the law of good works" (*Midr. Koheleth*, 88, 4); "Israel shall eat the years of the Messiah;" "the just eat of the Shechînah," etc.

is death. They did not seek the truth, and it was more and more taken from them. They had nothing, and therefore from them was taken even what they had. In language yet more emphatic, under figures yet more startling in their paradox, Jesus said to them, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you;"[1] and again, as a still further enforcement and expansion of the same great truths — "He that eateth of this bread shall live forever."

No doubt the words were difficult, and, to those who came in a hard and false spirit, offensive; no doubt also the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, and the mystery of that Holy Sacrament, in which we spiritually eat His flesh and drink His blood, has enabled us more clearly to understand His meaning; yet there was in the words which He had used, enough, and more than enough, to shadow forth to every attentive hearer the great truth, already familiar to them from their own Law, that "Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God;" and the further truth that eternal life, the life of the soul, was to be found in the deepest and most intimate of all conceivable communions with the life and teaching of Him who spake. And it must be remembered that if the Lord's Supper has, for us, thrown a clearer light upon the meaning of this discourse, on the other hand the metaphors which Jesus used had not, to an educated Jew, one-hundredth part of the strangeness which they have to us. Jewish literature was exceedingly familiar with the symbolism which represented by "eating" an entire acceptance of and incorporation with the truth, and by "bread" a spiritual doctrine. Even the mere pictorial genius of the Hebrew language gave the clew to the right interpretation. Those who heard Christ in the synagogue of Capernaum must almost involuntarily have recalled similar expressions in their own prophets; and since the discourse was avowedly parabolic — since Jesus had expressly excluded all purely sensual and Judaic fancies — it is quite clear that much of their failure to comprehend Him rose not from the under-

[1] It is uncertain whether in calling Himself the Son of Man Jesus meant *Ben-Adam* (Job xxv. 6; Ps. viii. 4), *i.e.*, a representative of Humanity, or *Bar-Enosh* (Dan. vii. 13). The Hebrew word *enosh* represents man in his weakness (*homo*). (Grätz, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* iii. 237.) It probably conveyed to His hearers a general conception of the Messiah as the representative of Humanity alike in its feebleness and in its glory (*v. supr.*, p. 131).

standing, but from the will. His saying was hard, as St. Augustine remarks, only to the hard; and incredible only to the incredulous. For if bread be the type of all *earthly* sustenance, then the "bread of heaven" may well express all *spiritual* sustenance, all that involves and supports eternal life. Now the lesson which He wished to teach them was *this* — that eternal life is in the Son of God. They, therefore, that would have eternal life must partake of the bread of heaven, or — to use the other and deeper image — must eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man.[1] They must *feed on Him in their hearts by faith.* They might accept or reject the truth which He was revealing to their consciences, but there could be no possible excuse for their pretended incapacity to understand its meaning.

There is a teaching which is, and is intended to be, not only instructive but probationary; of which the immediate purpose is not only to *teach*, but to *test.* Such had been the object of this memorable discourse. To comprehend it rightly required an effort not only of the understanding, but also of the will. It was *meant* to put an end to the merely selfish hopes of that "rabble of obtrusive chiliasts" whose irreverent devotion was a mere cloak for worldliness; it was *meant* also to place before the Jewish authorities words which they were too full of hatred and materialism to understand. But its sifting power went deeper than this. Some even of the disciples found the saying harsh and repulsive. They did not speak out openly, but Jesus recognized their discontent, and when He had left the synagogue, spoke to them, in this third and concluding part of His discourse,[2] at once more gently and less figuratively than He had done to the others. To these He prophesied of that future ascension, which should prove to them that He had indeed come down from heaven, and that the words about His flesh — which should then be taken into heaven — *could* only have a figurative meaning. Nay, with yet further compassion for their weakness, He intimated to them the significance of those strong metaphors in which He had purposely veiled His words from the curious

[1] The following profound remark of Von Ammon will help the reader to understand this chapter. "What is true," he says, "of the *bread of heaven*, is true also of the *flesh and blood of the Son of Man;* for these predicates are only substitutes for the original image of the *bread of life*, and are subject to the same analogical explanations as this last is" (quoted by Lange, *Life of Christ*, iii. 157). "Believe, and thou hast eaten," is the formula of St. Augustine; "believe, and thou shalt eat," that of Calvin.

[2] It will be observed that verses 26–40 are addressed mainly to the multitude; verses 43–58 to the leading Jews; verses 61–65 to the disciples.

eyes of selfishness and the settled malice of opposition. In one sentence which is surely the key-note of all that had gone before — in a sentence which surely renders nugatory much of the pseudo-mystical and impossibly elaborate exegesis by which the plain meaning of this chapter has been obscured, He added —

"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: *the words that I speak*[1] *unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.*" Why then had they found His words so hard? He tells them: it was because some of them believed not; it was because, as He had already told the Jews, the spirit of faith is a gift and grace of God, which gift these murmurers were rejecting, against which grace they were struggling even now.[2]

And from that time many of them left Him; many who had hitherto sought Him, many who were not far from the kingdom of heaven. Even in the midst of crowds His life was to be lonelier thenceforth, because there would be fewer to know and love Him. In deep sadness of heart He addressed to the Twelve the touching question, "Will ye also go away?" It was Simon Peter whose warm heart spoke out impetuously for all the rest. He at least had rightly apprehended that strange discourse at which so many had stumbled. "Lord," he exclaims, "to whom shall we go? THOU HAST THE WORDS OF ETERNAL LIFE. But we believe and are sure that Thou art the Holy One of God."[3]

It was a noble confession, but at that bitter moment the heart of Jesus was heavily oppressed, and He only answered —

"Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?"[4]

[1] Or perhaps "have spoken," λελάληκα (א, B, C, D, L, most versions), etc.; but I would not, with Stier and Alford, confine ῥήματα merely to "my flesh" and "my blood."

[2] There seems to be a special reference to Judas in these words (ver. 66), and it seems very probable that the first obvious extinction of purely temporal Messianic hopes may have been with him the turning-point of that rejection which ended in his ultimate treachery.

[3] This, and not "that Christ, the Son of the living God" — a confession which was given for the first time some months *afterwards* — is almost undoubtedly the true reading. (א, B, C, D, L, etc.)

[4] The English version is unfortunate, because it does not maintain the distinction between διάβολος, the word here used, and δαιμόνιον, which it usually renders "devil" — *e.g.*, in "He has a devil." Euthymius here explains "devil" by either "servant of the devil" or "conspirator;" and the latter meaning seems very probable. Indeed, this very word (ἐπίβουλος) is used by the LXX. to render the Hebrew *Satan* in 1 Kings v. 4; 1 Sam. xxix. 4. I have already noticed how much more lightly the Jews (and indeed all Orientals to this day) used the word "Satan" than we do. This

The expression was terribly strong, and the absence of all direct parallels renders it difficult for us to understand its exact significance. But although it was afterwards known that the reproach was aimed at Judas, yet it is doubtful whether at the actual time any were aware of this except the traitor himself.

Many false or half-sincere disciples had left Him: might not these words have been graciously meant to furnish one more opportunity to the hard and impure soul of the man of Kerioth, so that before being plunged into yet deeper and more irreparable guilt, *he* might leave Him too? If, so the warning was rejected. In deadly sin against his own conscience, Judas stayed to heap up for himself wrath "against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God."

indeed may almost be called a *modus loquendi* among them, and if Jesus spoke in Aramaic, and used the word שָׂטָנָא, then the reproach is not one-tenth part so fearful as it sounds to us. Thus, the sons of Zeruiah are called a Satan to David (2 Sam. xix. 22), and Hadad is called a "Satan" to King Solomon (1 Kings xi. 23, where it is merely rendered "adversary"); and in Matt. xvi. 23, the word is applied to Peter himself. "When the ungodly curseth Satan" (*i.e.*, an enemy?), says the son of Sirach (xxi. 27), "he curseth his own soul." All this is important in many ways. Further, we may observe that διάβολος occurs by no means frequently in the New Testament. (*V. supra*, pp. 185, 258, 259.)

CHAPTER XXXI.

GATHERING OPPOSITION.

Ἐξωθεν παραληφθεῖσαι ἄγραφοι κενοφώνιαι. — JUSTINIAN, *Nov.* 146.

ALTHOUGH the discourse which we have just narrated formed a marked period in our Lord's ministry, and although from this time forward the clouds gather more and more densely about His course, yet it must not be supposed that this was the first occasion, even in Galilee, on which enmity against His person and teaching had been openly displayed.

1. The earliest traces of doubt and disaffection arose from the expression which He used on several occasions, "Thy sins be forgiven thee." It was in these words that He had addressed the woman that was a sinner, and the sick of the palsy. On both occasions the address had excited astonishment and disapproval, and at Simon's house, where this had found no *open* expression, and where no miracle had been wrought, Jesus gently substituted another expression.[1] But it was not so at the healing of the palsied man; there an open murmur had arisen among the Scribes and Pharisees, and there, revealing more of His true majesty, Jesus, by His power of working miracles, had vindicated His right to forgive sins.[2] The argument was unanswerable, for not only did the prevalent belief connect sickness in every instance with actual sin, but also it was generally maintained, even by the Rabbis, "that no sick man is healed from his disease, until all his sins have been forgiven."[3] It was, therefore, in full accordance with their own notions that He who by His own authority could

[1] Luke vii. 48–50. See p. 232.

[2] Matt. ix. 6; Mark ii. 10; Luke v. 24. (See p. 263.) "But as the little bubbling and gentle murmurs of the water are presages of a storm, and are more troublesome in their prediction than in their violence; so were the arguings of the Pharisees symptoms of a secret displeasure and an ensuing war; though at first represented in the civilities of question and scholastical discourses, yet they did but forerun vigorous objections and bold calumnies, which were the fruits of the next summer" (Jer. Taylor, *Life of Christ*, II. xii.).

[3] *Nedarim*, f. 41, 1, in Schöttg., *Hor. Hebr.*, p. 93; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, ii. 300.

heal diseases, could also, by His own authority, pronounce that sins were forgiven. It was true that they could hardly conceive of either healing or forgiveness conveyed in such irregular channels, and without the paraphernalia of sacrifices, and without the need of sacerdotal interventions.[1] But, disagreeable as such proceedings were to their well-regulated minds, the fact remained that the cures were actually wrought, and were actually attested by hundreds of living witnesses. It was felt, therefore, that this ground of opposition was wholly untenable, and it was tacitly abandoned. To urge that there was "blasphemy" in His expressions would only serve to bring into greater prominence that there was miracle in His acts.

2. Nor, again, do they seem to have pressed the charge, preserved for us only by our Lord's own allusion, that He was "a glutton and a wine-drinker."[2] The charge was too flagrantly false and malicious to excite any prejudice against one who, although He did not adopt the stern asceticism of John, yet lived a life of the extremest simplicity, and merely did what was done by the most scrupulous Pharisees in accepting the invitation to feasts, where He had constantly fresh opportunities of teaching and doing good. The calumny was, in fact, destroyed when He had shown that the men of that generation were like wayward and peevish children whom nothing could conciliate, charging Jesus with intemperance because He did not avoid an innocent festivity, and John with demoniac possession because he set his face against social corruptions.

3. Nor, once more, did they press the charge of His not fasting.[3] In making that complaint they had hoped for the powerful aid of John's disciples; but when these had been convinced, by the words of their own prophet, how futile and unreasonable was their complaint, the Pharisees saw that it was useless to found a charge upon the neglect of a practice which was not only unrecognized in the Mosaic law,[4] but

[1] See Ewald, *Gesch. Christus*, p. 376.
[2] Matt. xi. 19; v. *supr.*, pp. 227, 242.
[3] Matt. xi. 16, 17. See p. 266.
[4] Except on the Great Day of Atonement. The *principle* of the answer given by Jesus to the disciples of John had already been recognized as to the four yearly fasts which seem to have become usual in the time of the prophet Zechariah (Zech. viii. 19). On the bi-weekly and other fasts of the Pharisees, see Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.*, cap. xxx. It is curious that the most ancient of the Rabbinic treatises — the *Megillath Taanith*, written before the destruction of the Temple — contains merely a list of days on which it is *forbidden* to fast; at the end of it are a certain number

which some of their own noblest and wisest teachers had not encouraged.[1] The fact that Jesus did not require His disciples to fast would certainly cause no forfeiture of the popular sympathy, and could not be urged to His discredit even before a synagogue or a Sanhedrin.

4. A deeper and more lasting offence was caused, and a far more deadly opposition stimulated, by Christ's choice of Matthew as an Apostle, and by His deliberate tolerance of — it might almost be said preference for — the society of publicans and sinners.[2] Among the Jews of that day the distinctions of religious life created a barrier almost as strong as that of caste. No less a person than Hillel had said that "no ignorant person could save himself from sin, and no '*man of the people*' be pious."[3] A scrupulous Jew regarded the multitude of his own nation who "knew not the Law" as accursed; and just as every Jew, holding himself to be a member of a royal generation and a peculiar people, looked on the heathen world with the sovereign disdain of an exclusiveness founded on the habits of a thousand years, so the purist faction regarded their more careless and offending brethren as being little, if at all, better than the very heathen.[4] Yet here was one who

of days on which fasting is recommended; *but this was no part of the original work* (Derenbourg, *Hist. de Pal.* 2).

[1] *Ex. gr.*, Simeon the Just, who made the Law, Worship, and Charity the three bases of the world (*Abhôth*, i. 2), and "sa douce et vraie piété s'opposait à toute exagération, et surtout aux abstinences rigoureuses" (Derenbourg, *Hist. Pal.* 51).

[2] Matt. ix. 11; xi. 19; Luke v. 30; vii. 34; xix. 7. See p. 265.

[3] לא עם הארץ חסיד (*Pirke Abhôth*, ii. 5). In the first clause, "no ignorant person" is literally "no empty cistern" (בור). The expression *am ha-arets*, "people of the land" (v. *ante*, p. 80), is exceedingly common in the Rabbis, and marks the arrogantly tyrannous sacerdotalism of the learned class (cf. John vii. 49). At the end of the Mishnaic tract *Horajôth* we find that a Priest takes precedence of a serving Levite, a Levite of other Israelites, an Israelite of a bastard (*Mamser*), a Mamser of the *Nethinim* (Josh. ix. 27), a Nethin of an alien (*Ger*), a Ger of a freedman; but if the Mamser be a pupil of the Rabbis, and the High Priest an ignoramus (*am ha-arets*), then such a Mamser has the precedence of the High Priest!" (See Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. in* Matt. xxiii. 14.) Their boasts as to the dignity of a *Talmîd chakam* are like those of the Stoics, which proved so amusing to Horace (*Ep.* i. 1, 106; Cicero, *Pro Muraena*, 29). The definition of an *am ha-arets* given in *Sota*, f. 21, 1, is one who either does not repeat the daily *Krishma*, or does not wear *tephillin*, or *tsitsith*, or does not *wait on the learned*. See Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr. in* John vii. 49, for yet stronger specimens of this intense spirit of Pharisaism which it was the very object of Jesus to replace by a nobler Humanitarianism (Acts x. 34). There is perhaps no kind of caste-feeling more hateful than the self-glorifying arrogance of a pseudo-erudition.

[4] Our Lord, when He said, "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican" (Matt. xviii. 17), was simply adopting a current form of expression. The amazing virulence of Jewish exclusiveness is illustrated

mingled freely and familiarly — mingled without one touch of *hauteur* or hatred — among offensive publicans and flagrant sinners. Nay, more, He suffered women, out of whom had been cast seven devils, to accompany Him in His journeys, and harlots to bathe His feet with tears! How different from the Pharisees, who held that there was pollution in the mere touch of those who had themselves been merely touched by the profane populace, and who had laid down the express rule that no one ought to receive a guest into his house if he suspected him of being a sinner![1]

Early in His ministry, Jesus, with a divine and tender irony, had met the accusation by referring them to His favorite passage of Scripture — that profound utterance of the prophet Hosea, of which He bade them "go and learn" the meaning — "I will have mercy and not sacrifices." He had further rebuked at once their unkindliness and their self-satisfaction by the proverb, "They that be whole need not a physican, but they that are sick." The objection did not, however, die away. In His later days, when He was journeying to Jerusalem, these incessant enemies again raised the wrathful and scornful murmur, "This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them;"[2] and then it was that Jesus answered them and justified His ways, and revealed more clearly and more lovingly than had ever been done before the purpose of God's love towards repentant sinners, in those three exquisite and memorable parables, the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, and above all, the prodigal son. Drawn from the simplest elements of daily experience, these parables, and the last especially, illustrated, and illustrated forever, in a rising climax of tenderness, the deepest mysteries of the Divine compassion — the joy that there is

in *Shabbath*, xiv. 4; *Babha Kama*, viii. 6, 4; 2 Esdras vi. 55, etc. (Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 214.)

[1] In *Bab. Berachôth*, 43, 6, one of the six things forbidden to the pupils of the wise is "to sit at table in a company of the unlearned." Other instances of insolent self-assertion against the *am ha-arets* are given in Gfrörer, i. 191.

[2] διεγόγγυζον (Luke xv. 2), "kept angrily muttering to each other." (See *supra*, p. 264.) The contrast of this conduct with that of the Pharisees becomes more striking when we remember the extraordinary and almost ludicrous precautions which they took to secure the impossible end of avoiding every conceivable legal impurity in their *chabhoorôth*, or social meals. How ineradicable the feeling was, we may see most strikingly by observing that it still infected even some of the disciples and apostles long years after the resurrection of their Lord, who contended with Peter, saying, "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them!" (Acts xi. 3) — the exact echo of the caste-feeling here described (cf. Gal. ii. 12).

in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.[1] Where, in the entire range of human literature, sacred or profane, can anything be found so terse, so luminous, so full of infinite tenderness — so faithful in the picture which it furnishes of the consequences of sin, yet so merciful in the hope which it affords to amendment and penitence — as this little story? How does it summarize the consolations of religion and the sufferings of life! All sin and punishment, all penitence and forgiveness, find their best delineation in these few brief words. The radical differences of temperament and impulse which separate different classes of men — the spurious independence of a restless free-will — the preference of the enjoyments of the present to all hopes of the future — the wandering far away from that pure and peaceful region which is indeed our home, in order to let loose every lower passion in the riotous indulgence which wastes and squanders the noblest gifts of life — the brief continuance of those fierce spasms of forbidden pleasure — the consuming hunger, the scorching thirst, the helpless slavery, the unutterable degradation, the uncompassionated anguish that must inevitably ensue — where have these myriad-times-repeated experiences of sin and sorrow been ever painted — though here painted in a few touches only — by a hand more tender and more true than in the picture of that foolish boy demanding prematurely the share which he claims of his father's goods; journeying into a far country, wasting his substance with riotous living; suffering from want in the mighty famine; forced to submit to the foul infamy of feeding swine, and fain to fill his belly with the swine-husks which no man gave.[2] And then the coming to himself, the memory of his father's meanest servants who had enough and to spare, the return homewards, the agonized confession, the humble, contrite, heart-broken entreaty, and that never-

[1] In the lost sheep we have the stupid, bewildered sinner; in the lost drachma, the sinner stamped with God's image, but lying lost, useless, and ignorant of his own worth; in the prodigal son, the conscious and willing sinner.

[2] This conception of ignominy would be far more intense to a Jew than to us. The Jews detested swine so much, that they would only speak of a pig euphemistically as *dabhar acheer*, "another thing." The husks, κεράτια, are the long bean-like pods of the carob-tree, or Egyptian fig (*Ceratonia siliqua*, Linn.). I have tasted them in Palestine; they are stringy, sweetish, coarse, and utterly unfit for human sustenance. They are sold by fruiterers in Paris, and are said to be used in distilling *maraschino*. The tree was called the "locust-tree," from the mistaken notion that its κεράτια are the ἀκρίδες on which St. John fed (Matt. iii. 4; Lev. xi. 22). ἐδίδου, either "*ever gave*" or "*chose to give*" to him.

to-be-equalled climax which, like a sweet voice from heaven, has touched so many million hearts to penitence and tears —

"And he arose and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off his father saw him and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to the servants, Bring forth the best robe and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet: and bring hither the fatted calf and kill it; and let us eat and be merry: for this my son was dead and is alive again, was lost and is found."

And since no strain could rise into sweeter and nobler tenderness — since death itself could reveal no lovelier or more consolatory lesson than it conveys to sinful man — to us it might seem that this is the true climax of the parable, and that here it *should* end as with the music of angel harps. And here it would have ended had the mystery of human malice and perversity been other than it is. But the conclusion of it bears most directly on the very circumstances that called it forth. The angry murmur of the Pharisees and Scribes had shown how utterly ignorant they were, in their cold dead hardness and pride of heart, that, in the sight of God, the tear of one truly repentant sinner is transcendently dearer than the loveless and fruitless formalism of a thousand Pharisees. Little did they suspect that penitence can bring the very harlot and publican into closer communion with their Maker than the combined excellence of a thousand vapid and respectable hypocrisies. And therefore it was that Jesus added how the elder son came in, and was indignant at the noise of merriment, and was angry at that ready forgiveness, and reproached the tender heart of his father, and dragged up again in their worst form the forgiven sins of this brother whom he would not acknowledge, and showed all the narrow unpardoning malignity of a heart which had mistaken external rectitude for holy love.[1] Such self-righteous malice, such pitiless and repulsive respecta-

[1] There are several touches in the original which a translation can hardly preserve, but which show the deepest insight into the angry human heart in all its mean jealousies and rancors — *e.g.*, the sharp indignant ἰδοὺ (See!) with which the elder son begins his expostulation; the inability to recognize his free service as anything better than a constant slavery (ἐμοὶ τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω); the position of ἐμοί ("you never gave *me* even a kid that *I* might enjoy myself with *my* friends!"); the use of "*this son of yours*" instead of "my brother;" the exaggerated and concentrated malignity of

bility, is an evil more inveterate — a sore more difficult to probe, and more hard to cure — than open disobedience and passionate sin. And truly, when we read this story, and meditate deeply over all that it implies, we may, from our hearts, thank God that He who can bring good out of the worst evil — honey out of the slain lion, and water out of the flinty rock — could, even from an exhibition of such a spirit as this, draw His materials for the divinest utterance of all revelation — the parable of the prodigal son.[1]

The relation of Jesus to publicans and sinners was thus explained, and also the utter antagonism between His spirit and that inflated religionism which is the wretched and hollow counterfeit of all *real* religion. The Judaism of that day substituted empty forms and meaningless ceremonies for true righteousness; it mistook uncharitable exclusiveness for genuine purity; it delighted to sun itself in the injustice of an imagined favoritism from which it would fain have shut out all God's other children; it was so profoundly hypocritical as not even to recognize its own hypocrisy; it never thought so well of itself as when it was crushing the broken reed and trampling out the last spark from the smoking flax;[2] it thanked God for the very sins of others, and thought that He could be pleased with a service in which there was neither humility, nor truthfulness, nor loyalty, nor love. These poor formalists, who thought that they were so rich and increased with goods, had to learn that they were wretched, and poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked. These sheep, which fancied that they had not strayed, had to understand that the poor *lost* sheep might be carried home on the shoulders of the Good Shepherd with a yet deeper tenderness; these elder sons had to learn that their Father's spirit, however little they might be able to realize it in their frozen unsympathetic hearts, was *this:* "It was meet that we should make merry and be glad, for this *thy*

the ὁ καταφαγών σου τον βίον μετὰ πορνῶν, describing his brother's wasted life in its worst and grossest form. This brutally uncharitable desire to make the worst of sin repented of, is the basest touch of all.

[1] I have here touched on one side of the parable only — its individual meaning. Of course it involves, on all sides, infinitely more than has here been educed from it; especially the relation of Jews to the Gentile world, and the desperately jealous fury and rancor kindled in the Jewish mind (Acts xiii. 50; xxviii. 28, etc.) by the bare mention of the truth that God could accept, and pardon, and bless the Gentiles no less than the children of Abraham.

[2] "Qui peccatori non porrigit manum — quassatum calamum confringit, qui scintillam fidei contemnit in parvulis, linum extinguit fumigans." (Jer.)

brother was dead and is alive again, was lost and is found."[1]

5. But however much it might be manifest that the spirit of the Christ and the spirit of the Pharisee were inalienably opposed to each other, yet up to this point the enemies of Jesus were unable to ruin His influence or check His work. To forgive, with the same word which healed the diseases, the sins by which they believed all diseases to be caused — to join in social festivities — to associate with publicans and sinners — were not, and could not be construed into, offences against the Law. But a weightier charge, more persistently reiterated, more violently resented, remained behind — a charge of distinctly violating the express laws of Moses by non-observance of the Sabbath. This it was which caused a surprise, an exacerbation, a madness, a thirst for sanguinary vengeance, which pursued Him to the very cross. For the Sabbath was a Mosaic, nay, even a primeval institution, and it had become the most distinctive and the most passionately reverenced of all the ordinances which separated the Jew from the Gentile as a peculiar people. It was at once the sign of their exclusive privileges, and the centre of their barren formalism. Their traditions, their patriotism, even their obstinacy, were all enlisted in its scrupulous maintenance. Not only had it been observed in heaven before man was, but they declared that the people of Israel had been chosen for the sole purpose of keeping it.[2] Was it not even miraculously kept by the Sabbatical river of the Holy City? Their devotion to it was only deepened by the universal ridicule, inconvenience, and loss which it entailed upon them in the heathen world. They were even proud that, from having observed it with a stolid literalism, they had suffered themselves on that day to lose battles, to be cut to pieces by their enemies, to see Jerusalem itself imperilled and captured. Its observance had been fenced round by the minutest, the most painfully precise, the most ludicrously insignificant restrictions. The Prophet had called it "a

[1] He will not encourage the jealous hatred which had peeped out in the elder son's half-repudiation of this relationship ("this son of thine," ὁ υἱός σου οὗτος, Luke xv. 30).

[2] These extravagances occur in the *Book of Jubilees*, a collection of fiercely fanatical *Hagadóth* which dates from the first century. For the fable of the Sabbatic river (which probably arose from the intermittent character of some of the springs about Jerusalem) see Josephus, *B. J.* vii. 5, § 1. It might be said, however, to *violate* the Sabbath rather than *keep* it, for it only ran every seventh day.

delight," and therefore it was a duty even for the poor to eat three times on that day. They were to feast on it, though no fire was to be lighted and no food cooked. According to the stiff and narrow school of Shammai, no one on the Sabbath might even comfort the sick or enliven the sorrowful. Even the preservation of life was a breaking of the Sabbath; and, on the other hand, even to kill a flea was as bad as to kill a camel.[1] Had not the command to "do no manner of work upon the Sabbath day" been most absolute and most emphatic? had not Moses himself and all the congregation caused the son of Shelomith to be stoned to death for merely gathering sticks upon it? had not the Great Synagogue itself drawn up the thirty-nine *abhôth* and quite innumerable *toldôth*, or prohibitions of labors which violated it in the first or in the second degree? Yet here was One, claiming to be a prophet, yea, and more than a prophet, deliberately setting aside, as it seemed to them, the traditional sanctity of that day of days! Even an attentive reader of the Gospels will be surprised to find how large a portion of the enmity and opposition which our Lord

[1] You must not walk through a stream on stilts, for you really carried the stilts. A woman must not go out with any ribbons about her, unless they were sewed to her dress. A false tooth must not be worn. A person with the toothache might not rinse his mouth with vinegar, but he might hold it in his mouth and swallow it. No one might write down two letters of the alphabet. The sick might not send for a physician. A person with lumbago might not rub or foment the affected part. A tailor must not go out with his needle on Friday night, lest he should forget it, and so break the Sabbath by carrying it about. A cock must not wear a piece of ribbon round its leg on the Sabbath, for this would be to carry something! Shammai would not intrust a letter to *a pagan* after Wednesday, lest he should not have arrived at his destination on the Sabbath. He was occupied, we are told, all the week with thinking as to how he should keep the Sabbath. The Shammaites held that Sabbatism applied (1) to men, (2) to beasts, (3) to things. The Hillelites denied the last, not holding it necessary to put out a lamp which had been kindled before the Sabbath, or to remove fish-nets, or to prevent the dropping of oil in a press. Rabbinnical authorities for each of these statements (though as usual the Talmud is self-contradictory about some of them) may be found in Schöttgen; Lightfoot; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, ii. 297; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* s. v. "Sabbathum;" Buxtorf, *De Synag. Jud.*, pp. 352–356; Derenbourg, *Hist. Pal.* 38. The Rabbi Kolonimos, having been accused of murdering a boy, wrote on a piece of paper, put it on the dead boy's lips, and so made the corpse rise and reveal the true murderer, in order to save himself from being torn to pieces. As this had been done on the Sabbath, he spent the rest of his life in penance, and on his death-bed ordered that for a hundred years every one who passed should fling a stone at his tomb, because every one who profaned the Sabbath should be stoned! Synesius (*Ep.* 4) tells a story of a pilot who, in the midst of a storm, dropped the rudder when the Sabbath began, and would only take it again when his life was threatened. Reland (*Antt. Hebr.*, p. 518) does not quote the story accurately.

excited, not only in Jerusalem, but even in Galilee and in Peræa, turned upon this point alone.[1]

The earliest outbreak of the feeling in Galilee must have occurred shortly after the events narrated in the last chapter. The feeding of the five thousand, and the discourse in the synagogue of Capernaum, took place immediately before a Passover. None of the Evangelists narrate the events which immediately succeeded. If Jesus attended this Passover, He must have done so in strict privacy and seclusion, and no single incident of His visit has been recorded. It is more probable that the peril and opposition which He had undergone in Jerusalem were sufficient to determine His absence "until this tyranny was overpast."[2] It is not, however, impossible that, if He did not go in person, some at least of His disciples fulfilled this national obligation; and it may have been an observation of their behavior, combined with the deep hatred inspired by His bidding the healed man take up his bed on the Sabbath day, and by the ground which He had taken in defending Himself against that charge, which induced the Scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem to send some of their number to follow His steps, and to keep an espionage upon His actions, even by the shores of His own beloved lake. Certain it is that henceforth, at every turn and every period of His career — in the corn-fields, in synagogues, in feasts, during journeys, at Capernaum, at Magdala, in Peræa, at Bethany — we find Him dogged, watched, impeded, reproached, questioned, tempted, insulted, conspired against by these representatives of the leading authorities of His nation, of whom we are repeatedly told that they were not natives of the place, but "certain which came from Jerusalem."[3]

i. The first attack in Galilee arose from the circumstance that, in passing through the corn-fields on the Sabbath day,[4]

[1] See instances in Matt. xii. 1, *et seq.*; Mark ii. 23–28; iii. 1–6; Luke vi. 1–11; xiii. 14–17; xiv. 1–6; John v. 10, *et seq.*; vii. 23; ix. 14, *et seq.*

[2] John v. 16, 18.

[3] Matt. xv. 1; Mark iii. 22; vii. 1. Those, however, mentioned at an earlier period (Luke v. 17) were not the same as these hostile spies. We see from Acts xiv. 19; xvii. 13; Gal. ii. 12, how common among the Jews was the base and demoralizing spirit of heresy-hunting.

[4] This Sabbath is called in St. Luke by the mysterious name of the second-first Sabbath, ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ — *i.e.*, the first of the second, not *vice versâ* as in the English version. There is not much importance in discovering the exact significance of this isolated expression, because the time of year is amply marked by the fact that the wheat (for the context shows that it could hardly have been barley) was ripe — *i.e.*, that the time was a week or two after the Passover, when the first ripe sheaf was offered

His disciples, who were suffering from hunger, plucked the ears of corn, rubbed them in the palms of their hands, blew away the chaff, and ate. Undoubtedly this was a very high offence — even a capital offence — in the eyes of the Legalists. To reap and to thresh on the Sabbath were of course forbidden by one of the *abhôth* or primary rules; but the Rabbis had decided that to pluck corn was to be construed as reaping, and to rub it as threshing; even to walk on grass was forbidden, because that too was a species of threshing; and not so much as a fruit must be plucked from a tree.[1] All these latter acts were violations of the *toldôth* or "derivative rules." Perhaps these spying Pharisees had followed Jesus on this Sabbath day to watch whether He would go more than the prescribed *techûm ha-Shabbeth*, or Sabbath-day's journey of two thousand cubits;[2] but here they had been fortunate enough to light upon a far more heinous and flagrant scandal — an act of the disciples which, strictly and technically speaking, rendered them liable to death by stoning. Jesus Himself had not indeed shared in the offence. If we may press the somewhat peculiar expression of St. Mark, He was walking along through the corn-fields by the ordinary path, bearing His hunger as best He might, while the disciples were pushing for themselves a road through the

as the first-fruits of the harvest. It is probable that in the warm hollow of Gennesareth corn ripened earlier than on the plains. The reading δευτεροπρώτῳ is itself very doubtful, and is omitted by many MSS. (especially ℵ, B, L) and versions, including the Syriac and Coptic. Mr. Monro very ingeniously conjectures that originally the eye of a weary copyist may have been misled into it by seeing the διαπορ. or διασπορ., which comes near it. If this led to a misreading δευτέρῳ, the πρώτῳ may have been added as a gloss with reference to the ἑτέρῳ in verse 6. Almost every commentator has a new theory on the meaning of the word, supposing it to be genuine. The only opinions which seem sufficiently probable and sufficiently supported to make it worth while to mention them are — 1. The first Sabbath of the second month (Wetstein). 2. The first Sabbath in the second year of the Sabbatical cycle (Wieseler). 3. The first Sabbath after the second day of unleavened bread (Scaliger, Ewald, Keim, etc., following the analogy of σάβ. πρῶτον in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5, 41).

[1] Maimonides, *Shabbath*, c. 7, 8; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* 206; Sepp, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 329. Similarly, since "building" was one of the thirty-nine works forbidden on the Sabbath, curdling milk was also forbidden, because it was a sort of building. Forbidden works were divided into "fathers" (*abhôth*, ἀρχηγικώτατα αἴτια, Phil. *De Vit. Mog.* 686) and "descendants" (*toldôth*): and to build was one of the *abhôth*; to make cheese, one of the *toldôth*.

[2] In the Jerus. Targ., Exod. xvi. 29, the words "beyond two thousand yards" are added, as also on Ruth i. 16. Yet the Pharisees had ingenious rules of their own for getting over the resultant inconveniences, which may be found in the Mishna (*Erubhîn* = mixtures, or amalgamations of distances, 10 chapters). The treatise *Shabbath* occupies 24 chapters.

standing corn by plucking the ears as they went along.[1] Now there was no harm whatever in plucking the ears; *that* was not only sanctioned by custom, but even distinctly permitted by the Mosaic law.[2] But the heinous fact was that this should be done *on a Sabbath!* Instantly the Pharisees are round our Lord, pointing to the disciples with the angry question, "See! why do *they* — with a contemptuous gesture towards the disciples — "do that which is not lawful on the Sabbath day?"

With that divine and instantaneous readiness, with that depth of insight and width of knowledge which characterized His answers to the most sudden surprises, Jesus instantly protected His disciples with personal approval and decisive support. As the charge this time was aimed not at Himself but at His disciples, His line of argument and defence differs entirely from that which, as we have seen, He had adopted at Jerusalem. *There* He rested His supposed violation of the Law on His personal authority; *here*, while He again declared Himself Lord of the Sabbath, He instantly quoted first from their own *Cethubhîn*, then from their own Law, a precedent and a principle which absolved His followers from all blame. "Have ye not read," He asked, adopting perhaps with a certain delicate irony, as He did at other times, a favorite formula of their own Rabbis, "how David not only went[3] into the House of God on the Sabbath day,[4] but actually ate the sanctified showbread, which it was expressly forbidden for any but the priests to eat?" If David, their hero, their favorite, their saint, had thus openly and flagrantly violated the letter of the Law, and had yet been blameless on the sole plea of a necessity higher than any merely ceremonial injunction, why were the disci-

[1] Mark ii. 23, καὶ ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας. In classical Greek, this would mean "began *to make themselves a road* by plucking." Meyer was the first to support this rendering, and he is followed by Volkmar, Bleek, Keim, etc., and by Bishop Wordsworth. It is doubtful, however, whether the classical usage of ὁδὸν ποιεῖν can be pressed, and it must be confessed that on this supposition the phrase would be a very curious one.

[2] Deut. xxiii. 25. I was surprised to see that the Arabs in some fields near the summit of Gerizim looked on with perfect indifference while our weary horses ate freely of the green springing corn.

[3] Some, however, have imagined that David merely *represented himself* as being accompanied by followers.

[4] This results both from the fact of the precedent being here adduced and from 1 Sam. xxi. 6 (compared with Lev. xxiv. 8, 9). It is by no means improbable that this very chapter had been read in the morning synagogue service of the day. The service was probably over, because none of the three meals took place till then.

ples to blame for the harmless act of sating their hunger? And again, if their own Rabbis had laid it down that there was no "Sabbatism in the Temple;"[1] that the priests on the Sabbath might hew the wood, and light the fires, and place hot fresh-baked showbread on the table, and slay double victims, and circumcise children, and thus in every way violate the rules of the Sopherim about the Sabbath, and yet be blameless[2] — nay, if in acting thus they were breaking the Sabbath at the bidding of the very Law which ordains the Sabbath — then if the Temple excuses *them*, ought not something[3] greater than the Temple to excuse these? And there was something greater than the Temple here. And then once more He reminds them that mercy is better than sacrifice. Now the Sabbath was expressly designed for mercy, and therefore not only might all acts of mercy be blamelessly performed thereon, but such acts would be more pleasing to God than all the insensate and self-satisfied scrupulosities which had turned a rich blessing into a burden and a snare. The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath, and therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath.[4]

In the Codex Bezae, an ancient and valuable manuscript now in the University Library at Cambridge, there occurs after Luke vi. 5 this remarkable addition — "On the same day, seeing one working on the Sabbath, He said to him, "*O man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed, and a transgressor of the law.*" The incident is curious; it is preserved for us in this manuscript alone, and it may perhaps be set aside as apocryphal, or at best as one of those ἄγραφα δόγματα, or "unrecorded sayings" which, like Acts xx. 35, are attributed to our Lord by tradition only. Yet the story is too striking, too intrinsically probable, to be at once rejected as unauthentic. Nothing could more clearly illustrate the spirit of our Lord's teaching, as it was understood, for instance, by St.

[1] So Maimonides, *Pesach.* 1 (following, of course, old and established authorities). Thus, too, it was lawful for the Israelites at the Feast of Tabernacles to carry their *lulabim* on the Sabbath (Reland, *Antt. Hebr.* 486).

[2] Even Hillel had some partial insight into this truth. He settled the question (against the Beni Bathira, and the more Pharisaic Shammai), that if the Passover day fell on a Sabbath the Paschal lamb might be slain by each Israelite in his own house, because lambs were slain in the Temple on every Sabbath by the priests.

[3] μεῖζον, neuter, not masc., as in the English version (Matt. xii. 6).

[4] Mark ii. 27, 28. A similar maxim (doubtless borrowed from this, and borrowed without profit) is found in the Talmud, "The Sabbath is given to thee, not thou to the Sabbath." (See Derenbourg, *Hist. de Palest.* 144.)

Paul.[1] For the meaning of the story obviously is — If thy work is of faith, then thou art acting rightly: if it is not of faith, it is sin.

ii. It was apparently on the day[2] signalized by this bitter attack, that our Lord again, later in the afternoon, entered the synagogue. A man — tradition says that he was a stone-mason, maimed by an accident, who had prayed Christ to heal him, that he might not be forced to beg — was sitting in the synagogue.[3] His presence, and apparently the purpose of his presence, was known to all; and in the chief seats were Scribes, Pharisees, and Herodians, whose jealous, malignant gaze was fixed on Christ to see what He would do, that they might accuse Him. He did not leave them long in doubt. First He bade the man with the withered hand get up and stand out in the midst. And then He referred to the adjudication of their own consciences the question that was in their hearts, formulating it only in such a way as to show them its real significance. "Is it lawful," He asked, "on the Sabbath days to do good or to do evil? to save life (as I am doing), or to kill (as you in your hearts are wishing to do)?" There could be but one answer to such a question, but they were not there either to search for or to tell the truth. Their sole object was to watch what He would do, and found upon it a public charge before the Sanhedrin, or if not, at least to brand Him thenceforth with the open stigma of a Sabbath-breaker. Therefore they met the question by stolid and impotent silence. But He would not allow them to escape the verdict of their own better judgment, and therefore He justified Himself by their own distinct practice, no less than by their inability to answer.

[1] Compare the closely analogous expressions of St. Paul about eating *εἰδωλόθυτα* (1 Cor. viii. 1). Some authors have rejected this story almost with contempt; yet could it be more wrong of the man (presumably for some strong and valid reason) to work than for the Jews to feast and idle? "It is better to plough than to dance," says St. Augustine; "they rest from good work, they rest not from idle work" (*Enarrat. in* Ps. xcii. 2).

[2] So it would seem from Matt. xii. 9, 10; Mark iii. 1. It is true that the received text of Luke vi. 6 says *ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ*, but probably so vague a note of time is not intended to be pressed, and indeed the Codex Bezae omits the *ἑτέρῳ*. St. Luke, only aware that the incident took place on a Sabbath, may merely mean, "It was also on a Sabbath day that," etc. On the other hand, the *μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν* of Matt. xii. 9 is more often used of longer journeys. The locality of these incidents is not further indicated, but it seems certain that they took place in Galilee.

[3] This tradition was preserved in the Gospel of the Nazarenes and Ebionites. "Caementarius eram, manibus victum quaeritans. Precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos." (Jer. *in* Matt. xii. 13.)

"Is there one of you," He asked, "who, if but a single sheep be fallen into a water-pit, will not get hold of it, and pull it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep?"[1] The argument was unanswerable, and their own conduct in the matter was undeniable; but still their fierce silence remained unbroken. He looked round on them with anger; a holy indignation burned in His heart, glowed on His countenance, animated His gesture, rang in His voice, as slowly He swept each hard upturned face with the glance that upbraided them for their malignity and meanness, for their ignorance and pride; and then suppressing that bitter and strong emotion as He turned to do His deed of mercy, He said to the man, "Stretch forth thy hand." Was not the hand withered? How could he stretch it forth? The word of Christ supplied the power to fulfil His command: he stretched it out, and it was restored whole as the other.

Thus in every way were His enemies foiled — foiled in argument, shamed into silence, thwarted even in their attempt to find some ground for a criminal accusation. For even in healing the man, Christ had done absolutely nothing which their worst hostility could misconstrue into a breach of the Sabbath law. He had not touched the man; He had not questioned him; He had not bid him exercise his recovered powers; He had but spoken a word, and not even a Pharisee could say that to speak a word was an infraction of the Sabbath, even if the word were followed by miraculous blessing! They must have felt how utterly they were defeated, but it only kindled their rage the more. They were filled with madness,[2] and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus. Hitherto they had been enemies of the Herodians. They regarded them as half-apostate Jews, who accepted the Roman domination,[3] imitated heathen practices,

[1] In the Gemara it is only allowed to *pull out* a sheep if it be in danger of drowning; planks, however, might be put in a less extreme case, and food supplied (see Reland, *Antt. Hebr.* 521). So too a man may be only healed if in peril of death (*Joma*, xiii. 6). Shemaia and Abtalion had not been blamed for breaking the Sabbath to revive the snow-covered and benumbed Hillel (v. *infr.* Excursus III., "Jesus and Hillel"). Stier suggests with much probability that many exceptions may have been permitted because of Christ's words. The institution of the *erûbh* showed how ready even the Pharisees were to tamper with Sabbatical observance *when it merely suited their convenience* (*v. infr.* Excursus IX., "Hypocrisy of the Pharisees").

[2] Luke vi. 11, ἄνοια, a kind of senseless rage.

[3] The very form of the name, *Herodiani*, probably indicates its Roman origin; I only say "probably," because Lepsius, *Ueber den Ursprung und den Aeltesten Gebrauch des Christennamens*, argues that the termination

adopted Sadducean opinions, and had gone so far in their flattery to the reigning house that they had blasphemously tried to represent Herod the Great as the promised Messiah. But now their old enmities were reconciled in their mad rage against a common foe. Something — perhaps the fear of Antipas, perhaps political suspicion, perhaps the mere natural hatred of worldlings and renegades against the sweet and noble doctrines which shamed their lives — had recently added these Herodians to the number of the Saviour's persecutors. As Galilee was the chief centre of Christ's activity, the Jerusalem Pharisees were glad to avail themselves of any aid from the Galilæan tetrarch and his followers. They took common counsel how they might destroy by violence the Prophet whom they could neither refute by reasoning, nor circumvent by law.

This enmity of the leaders had not yet estranged from Christ the minds of the multitude. It made it desirable, however, for Him to move to another place,[1] because He would "neither strive nor cry, neither should any man hear His voice in the streets," and the hour was not yet come when He should "send forth judgment to victory." But before His departure there occurred scenes yet more violent, and outbreaks of fury against Him yet more marked and dangerous. Every day it became more and more necessary to show that the rift between Himself and the religious leaders of His nation was deep and final; every day it became more and more necessary to expose the hypocritical formalism which pervaded their doctrines, and which was but the efflorescence of a fatal and deeply seated plague.

6. His first distinct denunciation of the principles that lay at the very basis of the Pharisaic system was caused by another combined attempt of the Jerusalem scribes to damage the position of His disciples.[2] On some occasion they observed that the disciples had sat down to a meal without previous ablutions. Now these ablutions were insisted upon with special solemnity by the Oral Tradition. The Jews of later times related with intense admiration how the Rabbi Akiba, when imprisoned and furnished with only sufficient

is an instance of the τύπος Ἀσίανος common in barbarian, and particularly Asiatic gentile or geographical adjectives.

[1] Matt. xii. 15 (Isa. xlii. 2). It is not necessarily implied that He left *Galilee;* or if He did, the events which follow may well have occurred before He was fully aware of the extent to which the virulence of the Pharisaic party had carried them.

[2] Matt. xv. 1–20; Mark vii. 1–23.

water to maintain life, preferred to die of starvation rather than eat without the proper washings.[1] The Pharisees therefore, coming up to Jesus as usual in a body, ask Him, with a swelling sense of self-importance at the justice of their reproach, "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread."

Before giving our Lord's reply, St. Mark pauses to tell us that the traditional ablutions observed by the Pharisees and all the leading Jews were extremely elaborate and numerous. Before every meal, and at every return from market,[2] they washed "with the fist,"[3] and if no water was at hand a man was obliged to go at least four miles to search for it. Besides this there were precise rules for the washing of all cups and *sextarii*[4] and banquet-couches (*triclinia*) and brazen vessels. The treatise *Shûlchan-Arûk*, or "Table arranged," a compendium of Rabbinical usages drawn up by Josef Karo in 1567, contains no less than twenty-six prayers by which these washings were accompanied. To neglect them was as bad as homicide, and involved a forfeiture of eternal life. And yet

[1] Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.*, p. 236. For Rabbinical rules about ablutions, and their minutiæ, see Schwab's *Berachôth*, pp. 309, 398, 436-438. They occupy a large portion of the sixth *seder* of the Talmud, which is called *Taharôth*, or "Purifications,"—especially the tracts *Mikvaôth*, "lavers and baths," and *Yadaîm*, or "hand-washings," in four chapters. Yet the Talmudists admit that hand-washing (*nitilath yadaim*) is *not* necessary if the hands be clean. (Pieritz, *Gosp. from Rabbinic Point of View*, p. 111.)

[2] Some render Mark vii. 4, "And after market they do no not eat (what they have purchased) until they have washed it." This is not *impossible*, but does not seem likely, although βαπτίσωνται (complete immersions = *nitûlôth*) implies more than νίψωνται ("wash the hands") in verse 3.

[3] πυγμῇ, *i.e.* thoroughly scrubbing each hand with the closed fist; the expression seems to be borrowed from some uses of the Hebrew אֲנַךְ, and the Syriac Version uses a similar word to render ἐπιμελῶς "carefully" in Luke xv. 8. Epiphanius (*Haer.* xv. *ad in.*) uses the word in the sense of "frequently," and in the Vulgate it is rendered *crebro*, so that Erasmus suggested a reading πυκνῇ (?). Others follow Theophylact in making it mean "up to the elbow" (ἄχρι ἀγκῶνος). The view given above is supported by the Rabbinical passages in Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. ad loc.* (See Schleusner, *Lex. Nov. Test.*)

[4] ξεστῶν (Mark vii. 4), one of St. Mark's Latinisms. Earthen vessels, if in any way rendered ceremonially unclean, were not washed, but broken (Lev. xv. 12). They were so particular about the sacred vessels that one day they washed the golden candlestick, and the Sadducees remarked to them "that soon they would think it necessary to wash the sun" (*Chayiya*, iii. 8; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Jud.* iii. 458.) The first and second tracts of the *Seder Taharôth*, viz., the thirty chapters of *Kalim* (vessels) and the eighteen of *Oholôth* (tents), deal with the defilements and purifications of dwellings, utensils, etc. Wotton (*Mishna*, i. 160) justly considers this the most Pharisaic "order" of the entire Mishna.

the disciples dared to eat with "common" (that is with unwashen) hands!

As usual, our Lord at once made common cause with His disciples, and did not leave them, in their simplicity and ignorance, to be overawed by the attack of these stately and sanctimonious critics. He answered their question by a far graver one. "Why," He said, "do *you* too violate the commandment of *God* by this 'tradition' of yours? For God's command was 'Honor thy father and thy mother;' but your gloss is, instead of giving to father and mother, a man may simply give the sum intended for their support to the sacred treasury, and say, 'It is *Corban*,' and then[1] — he is exempt from any further burden in their support! And many such things ye do. Ye hypocrites!" — it was the first time that our Lord had thus sternly rebuked them — "finely[2] do ye abolish and obliterate the commandment of God by *your traditions;* and well did Isaiah prophesy of you, 'This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; but in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandment of men.'"[3]

This was not only a defence of the disciples — because it

[1] Lightfoot's note on this passage is particularly valuable. He shows that our Lord is quoting a regular formula which occurs often in the tracts *Nedarim* and *Nezirôth*, both of which deal with vows. In Matt. xv. 6 the sentence remains thus unfinished; it is broken off by *aposiopesis*, as though our Lord shrank from the disgraceful inferences which such a son would annex to his words, and preferred to substitute for them His own stronger declaration that their iniquitous diversion of natural charities into the channels of pious ostentation would of course undermine all parental authority. קָרְבָּן means "a gift." It is rendered δῶρον in Jos. *Antt.* iv. 4, § 4; *B. J.* ii. 9, § 4. To say the word "*Corban*," however rashly and inconsiderately, involved a *konam*, or vow, and some of the Rabbis had expressly taught that a vow superseded the necessity of obedience to the fifth commandment. The explanation of this and the following verse seems to be that to say, "*Be it Corban*," was a sort of imprecation by the use of which a thing was *tabooed* to any one else; and that if it had been said to a parent even in haste or anger, the Rabbis still treated it as irrevocable.

[2] κάλῶς ἀθετεῖτε (Mark vii. 9), used in strong irony. The *Babha Kama*, or "first gate," and two following treatises of the Mishna are on compensations, etc., and abound in such traditions which supersede the Law. Another remarkable instance of doing away with the commandment by tradition was the unanimous exposition of the *lex talionis* (Exod. xxi. 24; Deut. xix. 12) as meaning nothing more than a fine. I, of course, see that the dislike to the *lex talionis* was due to a certain moral progress through which the Greeks and Teutons also passed; but to profess unbounded and superstitious adoration for the mere dead letter of a law, and then to do away with its clearest enactments by mere quibbles and fictions, was obvious hypocrisy.

[3] The iniquity which in the Middle Ages often extorted gifts of property for Church purposes from the ghastly terrors of dying sinners was a παράδοσις as bad as, perhaps worse than, that which Christ denounces.

showed that they merely neglected a body of regulations[1] which were in themselves so opposed to the very letter of the sacred law as, in many cases, to be more honored in the breach than the observance — but it was the open rebuke of One who assumed a superior and fearless authority, and a distinct reprobation of a system which guided all the actions of the Rabbinic caste, and was more reverenced than the Pentateuch itself. The quintessence of that system was to sacrifice the spirit to the letter, which, apart from that spirit, was more than valueless; and to sacrifice the letter itself to mere inferences from it which were absolutely pernicious. The Jews distinguished between the written Law (*Torah Skebeketeb*) and the traditional Law, or "Law upon the lip" (*Torah Shebeal pîh*); and the latter was asserted, by its more extravagant votaries, to have been orally delivered by God to Moses, and orally transmitted by him through a succession of elders. On it is founded the Talmud (or "doctrine"), which consists of the Mishna (or "repetition") of the Law, and the Gemera, or "supplement" to it; and so extravagant did the reverence for the Talmud become, that it was said to be, in relation to the Law, as wine to water; to read the Scriptures was a matter of indifference, but to read the Mishna was meritorious, and to read the Gemara would be to receive the richest recompense.[2] And it was this

[1] As it is to this day. Dr. Frankl says of the *Ashkenazîm* and *Perûshîm* at Jerusalem, that "they never study the Bible, and derive all their knowledge of it from the Talmud" (p. 34). (The Karaites, however, reject this doctrine of the Mekebalîm, and hold to the Bible only — *id.* p. 46.) "He that has learned the Scripture, and not the Mishna, is a blockhead." "The Law is like salt, the Mishna like pepper, the Gemara like balmy spice." (See many such passages quoted from the *Masseketh Soferim*, and elsewhere, in Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.*, ch. iii.; Carpzov. *App. Crit.*, p. 563.) — R. Menasseh Ben Israel compared the Law to the body, the Mishna to the soul, the Cabbala to the *soul of the soul*. Allen's *Mod. Judaism*, p. 74.) — The *Pirke Abhôth* ordains that at five a child should study the Bible, at ten the Mishna, at fifteen the Gemara. God Himself is represented as studying the Talmud, and repeating the decisions of the Rabbis! (*Chagiga*, p. 15, ap. Bartolocc. iii. 410). — In a passage of the *Babha Metsia*, f. 59, which almost reaches sublimity in its colossal sense of conviction, the decisions of the wise are upheld not only against miracles, but even against a voice from heaven! The passage has been often quoted. (See Cohen, *Les Déicides*, or Schwab's *Berachôth*, p. 72.)

[2] They asserted that God had taught Moses the Law by day, and the Mishna by night (Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* iii.). The Mishna was supposed to consist of five main elements: — 1. Traditional interpretations. 2. Undisputed constitutions. 3. Accepted opinions derived from the thirteen ways of reasoning. 4. Decrees of Prophets and Rabbis. 5. Legal precedents. (Maimon. *Porta Mosis*. See Etheridge, *Hebr. Lit.*, p. 119.) — The object of the Gemara was to explain the Mishna, (1) lexically, (2) dogmatically, (3) inferentially, (4) mystically. According to Aben Ezra, R. Sol. Jarchi,

grandiose system of revered commentary and pious custom which Jesus now so completely discountenanced, as not only to defend the neglect of it, but even openly to condemn and repudiate its most established principles. He thus consigned to oblivion and indifference the entire paraphernalia of *Hagadôth* ("legends") and *Halachôth* ("rules"), which, though up to that period it had not been committed to writing, was yet devoutly cherished in the memory of the learned, and constituted the very treasury of Rabbinic wisdom.

Nor was this all: not content with shattering the very bases of their external religion, He even taught to the multitude doctrines which would undermine their entire authority — doctrines which would tend to bring their vaunted wisdom into utter discredit. The supremacy of His disapproval was in exact proportion to the boundlessness of their own arrogant self-assertion; and turning away from them as though they were hopeless, He summoned the multitude, whom they had trained to look up to them as little gods, and spoke these short and weighty words:

"Hear me, all of you, and understand! Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth the man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, *that* defileth a man."[1]

The Pharisees were bitterly offended by this saying, as well indeed they might be. Condemnatory as it was of the too common sacerdotal infatuation for all that is merely ceremonial, that utterance of Jesus should have been the final death-knell of that superfluity of voluntary ceremonialism for which one of the Fathers coins the inimitable word *ἐθελοπερισσοθρησκεια*. His disciples were not slow to inform Him of the indignation which His words had caused, for they probably retained a large share of the popular awe for the leading sect. But the reply of Jesus was an expression of calm indifference to earthly judgment, a reference of all

R. Bechai, Maimonides, etc., the Law was the "Statutes" (חקים), and the Oral Law the "judgments," (משפטים) of Deut. iv. 14. R. Josh. Ben Levi said that in Exod. xxiv. 12 "the Tables" meant the Decalogue: "the Law," the Pentateuch; "commandments," the Mishna; "which I have written," the Prophets and Hagiographa; and "that thou mightest teach them," the Gemara (*Berachôth*, f. 5 *a*). (Schwab, p. 234.)

[1] There is a singular and striking parallel to these words in Philo, *De Opif. Mundi*, i. 29. "There enter into the mouth," he says, expanding a saying of Plato, "meats and drinks, corruptible nourishment of a corruptible body; but there go forth from it words, immortal laws of an immortal soul, by means of which is governed the reasonable life." Compare too the fragment of Democritus, *ἂν δὲ σαυτὸν ἐνδυπεν ἀνοίξῃς ποικίλον τι καὶ πολυπαθὲς κακῶν ταμεῖον εὑρήσεις . . . οὐκ ἔξωθεν ἐπιῤῥεόντων, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐγγείους καὶ αὐτόχθονας πηγὰς ἐχόντων, ἃς ἀνίησιν ἡ κακία.*

worth to the sole judgment of God as shown in the slow ripening of events. "Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Let them alone. They be blind leaders of the blind; and if the blind lead the blind, shall they not both fall into the ditch?"

A little later, when they were in-doors and alone, Peter ventured to ask for an explanation of the words which he had uttered so emphatically to the multitude. Jesus gently blamed the want of comprehension among His Apostles, but showed them, in teaching of deep significance, that man's food does but affect his material structure, and does not enter into his heart, or touch his real being; but that "from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, theft, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness."

Evil thoughts — like one tiny rill of evil, and then the burst of all that black overwhelming torrent!

"These are the things which defile a man; but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man."[1]

[1] There is a well-known difficulty about Mark vii. 19, where καθαρίζον is both ungrammatical and gives a very dubious sense. If with almost all the best MSS. (ℵ, A, B, E, F, L, etc.) we read καθαρίζων, we may then connect it with the previous λέγει (ver. 18) — *i.e.*, "He said this . . . purging, rendering clean, all meats" (cf. Acts xi. 5–9). It must, however, be admitted that the order of the words is a serious stumbling-block to this excellent interpretation. The only other way of explaining it is to make καθαρίζων agree with ἀφεδρῶν.

CHAPTER XXXII.

DEEPENING OPPOSITION.

"Si ignobilis, si inglorius, si inhonorabilis, Christus erit meus." — TERT. *Contr. Marc.* iii. 17.

THERE was to be one more day of opposition — more bitter, more dangerous, more personal, more implacable — one day of open and final rupture between Jesus and the Pharisaic spies from Jerusalem — before He yielded for a time to the deadly hatred of His enemies, and retired to find in heathen countries the rest which He could find no longer in the rich fields and on the green hills of Gennesareth. There were but few days of His earthly life which passed through a series of more heart-shaking agitations than the one which we shall now describe.[1]

Jesus was engaged in solitary prayer, probably at early dawn, and in one of the towns which formed the chief theatre of His Galilæan ministry. While they saw Him standing there with His eyes uplifted to heaven — for standing, not kneeling, was and is the common Oriental attitude in prayer — the disciples remained at a reverent distance; but when His orisons were over, they came to Him with the natural entreaty that He would teach them to pray, as John also taught his disciples. He at once granted their request, and taught them that short and perfect petition which has thenceforth been the choicest heritage of every Christian liturgy, and the model on which all our best and most acceptable prayers are formed. He had, indeed, already used it in the Sermon on the Mount, but we may be deeply thankful that for the sake of His asking disciples He here brought it into

[1] It seems clear from the order in which these scenes are narrated in Matt. xii. 22, seqq.; Mark iii. 11, seqq., that they took place in Galilee, and if so they cannot well be assigned to any other period than the present. In St. Luke they occur in the great episode (ix. 51–xviii. 34); but the hypothesis that this episode narrates the incidents of one or three journeys only is not tenable, and the order suggested by the other Evangelists seems here to be the more probable. The only note of time used by St. Luke is the very vaguest of all, "And it came to pass;" and the note of place is equally so, "in a certain place."

greater and more separate prominence. Some, indeed, of the separate clauses may already have existed, at least in germ, among the Jewish forms of prayer, since they resemble expressions which are found in the Talmud, and which we have no reason to suppose were borrowed from Christians.[1] But never before had all that was best and purest in a nation's prayers been thus collected into one noble and incomparable petition — a petition which combines all that the heart of man, taught by the Spirit of God, had found most needful for the satisfaction of its truest aspirations. In the mingled love and reverence with which it teaches us to approach our Father in heaven — in the spirituality with which it leads us to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness — in the spirit of universal charity and forgiveness which it inculcates — in that plural form throughout it which is meant to show us that selfishness must be absolutely and forever excluded from our petitions, and that no man can come to God as his Father without acknowledging that his worst enemies are also God's children — in the fact that of its seven petitions, one, and one only, is for any earthly blessing, and even that one is only for earthly blessings in their simplest form — in the manner in which it discountenances all the vain repetitions and extravagant self-tortures with which so many fanatic worshippers have believed that God could be propitiated — even in that exquisite brevity which shows us how little God desires that prayer should be made a burden and weariness — it is, indeed, what the Fathers have called it a *breviarium Evangelii* — the pearl of prayers.

Not less divine were the earnest and simple words which followed it, and which taught the disciples that men ought always to pray and not to faint, since, if importunity prevails over the selfishness of man, earnestness must be all-powerful with the righteousness of God. Jesus impressed upon them the lesson that if human affection can be trusted to give only useful and kindly gifts, the love of the Great Father who loves all, will, much more certainly, give His best and highest gift — even the gift of the Holy Spirit — to all that ask Him.

And with what exquisite yet vivid graciousness are these great lessons inculcated! Had they been delivered in the dull, dry, didactic style of most moral teaching, how could

[1] For the proof of this, and for the Jewish prayers which most resemble (but at how wide an interval!) the Lord's prayer, see Gfrörer, *Jahrh. des Heils*, ii. 169, and the parallels adduced on Matt. vi. 9 by Lightfoot, Schöttgen, and Wetstein.

they have touched the hearts, or warmed the imaginations, or fixed themselves indelibly upon the memories of those who heard them? But instead of being clothed in scholastic pedantism, they were conveyed in a little tale founded on the most commonplace incidents of daily life, and of a daily life full of simplicity and poverty. Journeying at night to avoid the burning heat, a man arrives at a friend's house. The host is poor, and has nothing for him; yet, because even at that late hour he will not neglect the duties of hospitality, he gets up, and goes to the house of another friend to borrow three loaves. But this other is in bed; his little children are with him; his house is locked and barred. To the gentle and earnest entreaty he answers crossly and roughly[1] from within, "Trouble me not." But his friend knows that he has come on a good errand, and he persists in knocking, till at last, not from kind motives, but because of his pertinacity,[2] the man gets up and gives him all that he requires. "Even so," it has been beautifully observed, "when the heart which has been away on a journey, suddenly at midnight (*i.e.*, the time of greatest darkness and distress) returns home to us — that is, comes to itself and feels hunger — and we have nothing wherewith to satisfy it, God requires of us bold, importunate faith." If such persistency conquers the reluctance of ungracious man, how much more shall it prevail with One who loves us better than we ourselves, and who is even more ready to hear than we to pray!

It has been well observed that the narrative of the life of Christ on earth is full of lights and shadows — one brief period, or even one day, starting at times into strong relief, while at other times whole periods are passed over in unbroken silence. But we forget — and if we bear this in mind, there will be nothing to startle us in this phenomenon of the Gospel record — we forget how large and how necessary a portion of His work it was to teach and train His immediate Apostles for the future conversion of the world. When we compare what the Apostles were when Jesus called them — simple and noble indeed, but ignorant, and timid, and slow of heart to believe — with what they became when He had departed from them, and shed the gift of His Holy Spirit into their hearts, then we shall see how little inter-

[1] He does not return the greeting *φίλε*; the expression, Μή μοι κόπους πάρεχε, "don't fash me," is an impatient one: the door *κέκλεισται*, "has been shut for the night;" *οὐ δύναμαι*, "I can't," meaning "I won't."

[2] *ἀναίδειαν*, "shamelessness," "unblushing persistence."

mission there could have been in His beneficent activity, even during the periods in which His discourses were delivered to those only who lived in the very light of His divine personality. Blessed indeed were they above kings and prophets, blessed beyond all who have ever lived in the richness of their privilege, since they could share His inmost thoughts, and watch in all its angelic sweetness and simplicity the daily spectacle of those "sinless years." But if this blessing was specially accorded to them, it was not for their own sakes, but for the sake of that world which it was their mission to elevate from despair and wickedness into purity and sober-mindedness and truth — for the sake of those holy hearts who were henceforth to enjoy a Presence nearer, though spiritual, than if, with the Apostles, they could have climbed with Him the lonely hills, or walked beside Him as He paced at evening beside the limpid lake.

The day which had begun with that lesson of loving and confiding prayer was not destined to proceed thus calmly. *Few* days of His life during these years can have passed without His being brought into distressing contact with the evidences of human sin and human suffering; but on this day the spectacle was brought before Him in its wildest and most terrible form. A man blind and dumb and mad, from those strange unaccountable influences which the universal belief attributed to demoniac possession, was brought before Him. Jesus would not leave him a helpless victim to the powers of evil. By His look and by His word He released the miserable sufferer from the horrible oppression — calmed, healed, restored him — "insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw."

It appears from our Lord's own subsequent words that there existed among the Jews certain forms of exorcism,[1] which to a certain extent, at any rate, were efficacious; but there are traces that the cures so effected were only attempted in milder and simpler cases. The dissolution of so hideous a spell as that which had bound this man — the power to pour light on the filmed eyeball, and to restore speech to the cramped tongue, and intelligence to the bewildered soul — was something that the people had never witnessed. The miracle produced a thrill of astonishment, a burst of unconcealed admiration. For the first time they openly debated whether He who had such power could be any other than

[1] Cf. Acts xix. 13. — An energetic formula used by the Jewish exorcists is preserved in *Bab. Shabbath*, 67 *a*. (Gfrörer, i. 413.)

their expected Deliverer. "Can this man," they incredulously asked, "can *he* be the Son of David?"[1]

His enemies could not deny that a great miracle had been performed, and since it did not convert, it only hardened and maddened them. But how could they dissipate the deep impression which it had made on the minds of the amazed spectators? The Scribes who came from Jerusalem, more astute and ready than their simple Galilæan brethren, at once invented a ready device for this purpose. "This fellow hath Beelzebul" — such was their notable and insolent solution of the difficulty — "and it is only by the prince of the devils that He casteth out the devils."[2] Strange that the ready answer did not spring to every lip, as it did afterwards to the lips of some who heard the same charge brought against Him in Jerusalem, "These are not the words of one that hath a devil." But the people of Galilee were credulous and ignorant; these grave and reverend inquisitors from the Holy City possessed an immense and hereditary ascendancy over their simple understandings, and, offended as they had been more than once by the words of Jesus, their whole minds were bewildered with a doubt. The awfulness of His personal ascendancy — the felt presence, even amid His tenderest condescensions, of something more than human — His power of reading the thoughts — the ceaseless and sleepless energy of His beneficence — the strange terror

[1] Matt. ix 32; xii. 23 (Luke xi. 15). Μήτι οὗτός ἐστι; the words express incredulous surprise — not *nonne?* but *num?* Cf. John viii. 22, μήτι ἀποκτενεῖ ἑαυτόν.

[2] Mark iii. 22; Matt. xii. 24. The οὗτος is intentionally contemptuous. Beelzebul (not Beelzebub, which is derived from the versions) is almost certainly the right reading (א, B, etc.). But the form and true meaning of the name are enveloped in obscurity. Beelzebub is mentioned as god of Ekron in 2 Kings i. 2, and both the LXX. and Josephus (*Antt.* ix. 2, § 1) understood this to mean "lord of flies" (Βάαλ μυῖαν). There may have been nothing derisive in such a designation, as some even of the Greek deities were worshipped as averters of pestilent insects (cf. Zeus Apomuios, Hercules Kornopion and Ipuktonos, Apollo Smintheus, etc.). But Beelzebul may also mean "lord of the (celestial) *habitation*," *i.e.*, "prince of the air" (Eph. ii. 2), and if so there is a sort of play on the word in the οἰκοδεσπότης of Matt. x. 25. On the other hand, the name may be "lord of dung," partly from the belief that demons haunted foul places (Matt. xii. 43; Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 139). This would be in accordance with those insulting paronomasias which the Jews, from a literal acceptation of Exod. xxiii. 13, etc., delighted to apply to heathen idols (cf. Kir Cheres, "city of destruction," for Kir Heres; Bethaven for Bethel; Bar-coziba, "son of a lie," for Bar-chocba, "son of a star," etc. See my *Chapters on Language*, p. 277). The accusation is practically the same as that of the Talmudists, that the miracles of Jesus were wrought by magic learnt in Egypt (*Bab. Shab.*, f. 104, 2; 43. 1). "Latrant catuli isti, sicut a canibus his edocti fuerunt." (Lightfoot, *ad. loc.*)

which He inspired in the poor demoniacs — the speech which sometimes rose into impassioned energy of denunciation, and sometimes, by its softness and beauty, held them hushed as infants at the mother's breast — the revulsion of their unbelieving hearts against that new world of fears and hopes which He preached to them as the kingdom of God — in a word, the shuddering sense that in some way His mere look and presence placed them in a nearer relation than they had ever been before with the Unseen World — all this, as it had not prepared them to accept the truth, tended from the first to leave them the ready victims of insolent, blasphemous, and authoritative falsehood.

And therefore, in a few calm words, Jesus shattered the hideous sophism to atoms. He showed them the gross absurdity of supposing that Satan could be his own enemy. Using an irresistible *argumentum ad hominem*, He convicted them by an appeal to the exorcisms so freely, but almost ineffectually, professed by themselves and their pupils. And when he had thus showed that the power which He exercised must be at once superior to Satan and contrary to Satan, and must therefore be spiritual and divine, He warned them of the awful sinfulness and peril of this their blasphemy against the Holy Spirit of God, and how nearly it bordered on the verge of that sin which alone, of all sins, could neither here nor hereafter be forgiven. And then, after these dim and mysterious warnings, speaking to them in language of yet plainer significance, He turned the light of truth into their raging and hypocritical hearts, and showed them how this Dead Sea fruit of falsehood and calumny could only spring from roots and fibres of hidden bitterness; how only from evil treasures hid deep in darkness, where the very source of light was quenched, could be produced these dark imaginings of their serpentine malignity.[1] Lastly, and with a note of warning which has never since ceased to vibrate, He warned them that the *words* of man reveal the true nature of the heart within, and that for those, as for all other false and lightly uttered words of idle wickedness, they should give account at the last day.[2] The weight and majesty of these words — the awful solemnity of the admonition which they conveyed — seem for a time to have reduced the Pharisees to silence, and to have checked the reiteration of their absurd and audacious blasphemy.

[1] Matt. xii. 34, Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν.
[2] Compare Matt. xii. 25–37; Mark iii. 22–30; Luke xi. 17–36.

And in the hush that ensued some woman of the company, in an uncontrollable enthusiasm of admiration — accustomed indeed to reverence these long-robed Pharisees, with their fringes and phylacteries, but feeling to the depth of her heart on how lofty a height above them the Speaker stood — exclaimed to Him in a loud voice,[1] so that all could hear —

"Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts[2] that thou hast sucked."

"Yea" — or as we may render it — "Nay, *rather*," He answered, "blessed are they that hear the Word of God, and keep it."

The woman with all the deep and passionate affection of her sex, had cried, How blest must be the mother of such a Son! and blessed indeed that mother was, and blessed was the fruit of her womb — blessed she was among women, and blessed because she believed,[3] yet hers was no exclusive blessedness; there is a blessedness yet deeper and loftier, the blessedness of obedience to the Word of God. "How many women," says St. Chrysostom,[4] "have blessed that Holy Virgin, and desired to be such a mother as she was! What hinders them? Christ has made for us a wide way to this happiness, and not only women, but men may tread it — the way of obedience; this it is which makes such a mother, not the throes of parturition."

But the Pharisees, though baffled for a moment, did not intend to leave Jesus long in peace. He had spoken to them in language of lofty warning, nay, even of stern rebuke — to *them*, the leaders and religious teachers of His time and country. What gave such boldness to one — a mere "empty cistern," a mere *am ha-arets* — who had but just emerged from the obscure and ignorant labors of a provincial artisan? how did He dare thus to address them. Let Him at least show them some sign — some sign from heaven, no mere exorcism or act of healing, but some great, indisputable, decisive sign of His authority. "Master, we would see a sign from Thee."

It was the old question which had assailed Him at His very earliest ministry, "What sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?"[5]

To such appeals, made only to insult and tempt — made by men who, unconvinced and unsoftened, had just seen a

[1] Luke xi. 27, ἐπάρασα φωνήν. [2] *Idem*, μαστοί. [3] Luke i. 42–45.
[4] Quoted by Bishop Wordsworth on Matt. xii. 48. [5] John ii. 18.

mighty sign, and had attributed it at once without a blush to demoniac agency — made, not from hearts of faith, but out of curiosity, and hatred, and unbelief — Jesus always turned a deaf ear. The Divine does not condescend to limit the display of its powers by the conditions of finite criticism, nor is it conformable to the counsel of God to effect the conversion of human souls by their mere astonishment at external signs. Had Jesus given them a sign from heaven, is it likely that it would have produced any effect on the spiritual children of ancestors who, according to their own accepted history, in the very sight, nay, under the very precipices of the burning hill, had sat down to eat and to drink, and risen up to play? Would it have had any permanent significance for the moral heirs of those who were taunted by their own prophets with having taken up the tabernacles of Moloch, and the star of their God Remphan, though they were guided by the fiery pillar, and quenched their thirst from the smitten rock? Signs they had seen and wonders in abundance, and now they were seeing the highest sign of a Sinless Life, and yet they did but rebel and blaspheme the more. No sign should be given, then, save in prophecies which they could not understand. "That evil and adulterous generation," He exclaimed, turning to the densely crowded multitude, "should have no sign save the sign of Jonah the prophet. Saved after a day and night amid the dark and tempestuous seas, he had been a sign to the Ninevites; so should the Son of Man be saved from the heart of the earth.[1] And those men of Nineveh, who repented at the preaching of Jonah, and the Queen of Sheba, who came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, should alike rise up in the judgment and condemn a generation that despised and rejected one greater than Solomon or than Jonah. For that generation had received every blessing: by the Babylonian captivity, by the Maccabæan revival, by the wise and noble rule of the Asmonæan princes, recently by the preaching of John, the evil spirit of idolatry and rebellion which distempered their fathers had been cast out of them; its old abode had been swept and garnished by the proprieties of Pharisees and the scrupulos-

[1] The "three days and three nights" of Matt. xii. 40 mean little more than a νυχθήμερον, or עוֹנָה — *e.g.*, from Friday evening to Sunday morning. This strange idiom has caused needless difficulties. See the passages quoted by Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr. ad loc.*). Cf. 1 Sam. xxx. 12, 13; 2 Chron. x. 5, 12; Deut. xiv. 28; xxvi. 12.

ities of Scribes; but alas! no good spirit had been invited to occupy the empty shrine, and now the old unclean possessor had returned with seven spirits more wicked than himself, and their last state was worse than the first."

His discourse was broken at this point by a sudden interruption.[1] News had again reached His family that He was surrounded by a dense throng, and was speaking words more strange and terrible than ever He had been known to utter; above all, that He had repudiated with open scorn, and denounced with uncompromising indignation, the great teachers who had been expressly sent from Jerusalem to watch His words. Alarm seized them; perhaps their informant had whispered to them the dread calumny which had thus called forth His stern rebukes. From the little which we can learn of His brethren, we infer that they were Hebrews of the Hebrews, and likely to be intensely influenced by Rabbinical and sacerdotal authority; as yet, too, they either did not believe on Him, or regarded His claims in a very imperfect light. Is not the time again come for them to interfere? can they not save Jesus, on whom they looked as *their* Jesus, from Himself? can they not exercise over Him such influence as shall save Him from the deadly perils to which His present teaching would obviously expose Him? can they not use towards Him such gentle control as should hurry Him away for a time into some region of secrecy and safety? They could not, indeed, reach Him in the crowd, but they could get some one to call His attention to their presence. Suddenly He is informed by one of His audience — "Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee." Alas! had they not yet learnt that if they would not enter, their sole right place was to stand without? that His hour was now come to pass far beyond the circle of mere human relationship, infinitely above the control of human brethren? Must their bold intrusive spirit receive one more check? It was even so; but the check should be given gently, and so as to be an infinite comfort to others. "Who is my mother?" He said to the man who had spoken, "and who are my brethren?" And then stretching forth His hand towards His disciples, He said, "Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother!"

[1] Matt. xii. 46, Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE DAY OF CONFLICT.

Ἐγγὺς μαχαίρας, ἐγγὺς Θεοῦ. — IGNAT. *Ad Smyrn.* 4.

UP to this point the events of this great day had been sufficiently agitating, but they were followed by circumstances yet more painful and exciting.

The time for the mid-day meal had arrived, and a Pharisee asked Him to come and lunch at his house.[1] There was extremely little hospitality or courtesy in the invitation. If not offered in downright hostility and bad faith — as we know was the case with similar Pharisaic invitations — its motive at the best was but curiosity to see more of the new Teacher, or a vanity which prompted him to patronize so prominent a guest. And Jesus, on entering, found Himself, not among publicans and sinners, where he could soothe, and teach, and bless — not among the poor to whom He could preach the kingdom of heaven — not among friends and disciples who listened with deep and loving reverence to His words — but among the cold, hard, threatening faces, the sneers and frowns, of haughty rivals and open enemies. The Apostles do not seem to have been invited. There was no sympathy of a Thomas to sustain Him, no gentleness of a Nathanael to encourage Him, no ardor of a Peter to defend, no beloved John to lean his head upon His breast. Scribe, Lawyer, and Pharisee, the guests ostentatiously performed their artistic ablutions, and then — each with extreme regard for his precedence — swept to their places at the board. With no such elaborate and fantastic ceremonies, Jesus, as soon as He entered, reclined at the table.[2] It was a short and trivial meal, and outside thronged the dense

[1] Not "to dine with him" (which would be ὅπως δειπνήσῃ), but rather "to lunch (ἀριστήσῃ) at his house." The ἄριστον, or morning meal, was a slight repast about twelve in the day, more like the French *déjeuner* than the English "breakfast," far slighter than the δεῖπνον. Lange has understood the scenes of this chapter better than any other commentator (*Leben Jesu*, iii. v. 7).

[2] Luke xi. 37, εἰσελθὼν ἀνέπεσεν.

multitude, hungering still and thirsting for the words of eternal life. He did not choose, therefore, to create idle delays and countenance a needless ritualism by washings, which at that moment happened to be quite superfluous, and to which a foolish and pseudo-religious importance was attached.

Instantly the supercilious astonishment of the host expressed itself in his countenance; and, doubtless, the lifted eyebrows and depreciating gestures of those unsympathizing guests showed as much as they dared to show of their disapproval and contempt. They were forgetting utterly who He was, and what He had done. Spies and calumniators from the first, they were now debasing even their pretentious and patronizing hospitality into fresh opportunity for treacherous conspiracy. The time was come for yet plainer language, for yet more unmeasured indignation; and He did not spare them. He exposed, in words which were no parables and could not be mistaken, the extent to which their outward cleanliness was but the film which covered their inward wickedness and greed. He denounced their contemptible scrupulosity in the tithing of potherbs, their flagrant neglect of essential virtues; the cant, the ambition, the publicity, the ostentation of their outward orthodoxy, the deathful corruption of their inmost hearts. Hidden graves were they over which men walk, and, without knowing it, become defiled.

And at this point, one of the lawyers who were present — some learned professor, some orthodox Masoret[1] — ventures to interrupt the majestic torrent of His rebuke. He had, perhaps, imagined that the youthful Prophet of Nazareth — He who was too meek and lowly of heart — He whose words among the multitude had hitherto breathed the spirit of such infinite tenderness — was too gentle, too loving, to be in earnest. He thought, perhaps, that a word of interpolation might check the rushing storm of His awakened wrath. He had not yet learnt that no strong or great character can be devoid of the element of holy anger. And so, ignorant of all that was passing in the Saviour's mind, amazed that people of such high distinction could be thus plainly and severely dealt with, he murmured in deprecatory tones, "Master, thus saying, thou reproachest us also!"

[1] Of course the mass of textual and other criticisms which form the Masora had existed for ages before they were collected or reduced to writing.

Yes, He reproached them also: they, too, heaped on the shoulders of others the burdens which themselves refused to bear; they, too, built the sepulchres of the prophets whom their sins had slain; they, too, set their backs against the door of knowledge, and held the key, so that none could enter in; on them too, as on all that guilty generation, should come the blood of all the prophets, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias, who perished between the altar and the Temple.[1]

The same discourse, but yet fuller and more terrible, was subsequently uttered by Jesus in the Temple of Jerusalem in the last great week of His life on earth; but thus did He, on this occasion, hurl down upon them from the heaven of His moral superiority the first heart-scathing lightnings of His seven-times-uttered woe.[2] They thought, perhaps, that He would have been deceived by their specious smoothness and hypocritical hospitality; but He knew that it was not out of true heart that they offered Him even the barest courtesies of life. The fact that He was alone among them, and that He should have been, as it were, betrayed into such company, was but an additional reason why the flames of warning and judgment should thus play about their heads, which hereafter, unless they repented, should strike them to the earth. Not for an instant could they succeed in deceiving Him. There is a spurious kindness, a bitter semblance of friendship which deserves no respect. It may pass current in the realms of empty fashion and hollow civility, where often the words of men's mouths are softer than butter, having war in their heart, and where, though their throat is an open sepulchre, they flatter with their tongue; but it shrivels to nothing before the refining fire of a divine discernment, and leaves nothing but a sickening fume behind. The time had come for Him to show to these hypocrites how well He knew the deceitfulness of their hearts, how deeply He hated the wickedness of their lives.

They felt that it was an open rupture. The feast broke

[1] See 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21; *v. infr.*, p. 537.

[2] The modern representatives and continuers of the Pharisee sect are called *Perushim*. "They proudly separate themselves from the rest of their co-religionists. . . . *Fanatical, bigoted, intolerant, quarrelsome, and in truth irreligious, with them the outward observance of the ceremonial law is everything, the moral law little binding, morality itself of no importance.*" Such is the testimony of a Jew! (Frankl, *Jews in the East*, E. Tr., ii. 27.) "*You are a Porish*," i.e., a Pharisee, is the bitterest reproach which one of the Chasidîm can utter (*id.*, p. 35).

up in confusion.[1] The Scribes and Pharisees threw off the mask. From fawning friends and interested inquirers, they suddenly sprang up in their true guise as deadly opponents. They surrounded Jesus, they pressed upon Him vehemently, persistently, almost threateningly; they began to pour upon Him a flood of questions, to examine, to catechize Him, to try and force words out of Him, lying in ambush, like eager hunters, to spring upon any confession of ignorance, on any mistake of fact — above all, on any trace of heresy on which they might found that legal accusation by which before long they hoped to put Him down.[2]

How Jesus escaped from this unseemly spectacle — how He was able to withdraw Himself from this display of hostility — we are not told. Probably it might be sufficient for Him to wave His enemies aside, and bid them leave Him free to go forth again. For, meanwhile, the crowd had gained some suspicion, or received some intimation, of what was going on within. They had suddenly gathered in dense myriads, actually treading on each other in their haste and eagerness.[3] Perhaps a dull, wrathful murmur from without warned the Pharisees in time that it might be dangerous to proceed too far, and Jesus came out to the multitude with His whole spirit still aglow with the just and mighty indignation by which it had been pervaded. Instantly — addressing primarily His own disciples, but through them the listening thousands — He broke out with a solemn warning, "Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is *hypocrisy*." He warned them that there was One before whose eye — ten thousand times brighter than the sun — secrecy was impossible. He bade them not be afraid of man — a fear to which the sad perturbances of these last few days might well have inclined them — but to fear Him who could not only destroy the body, but cast the soul also into the Gehenna[4] of fire. The God who loved them would care for

[1] This appears from the *κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ* of Luke xi. 53, which is the reading of ℵ, B, C, L, etc., instead of the much weaker reading of our version.

[2] Luke xi. 53, *ἤρξαντο δεινῶς ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν* (cf. Suid. *s. v.*). Theophylact explains it by *ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος κρατεῖν*. Vulg. "os opprimere." Classically, the word means "to dictate a repetition lesson" (Plato, *Euthyd.* 276 C).

[3] This seems to be implied by Luke xii. 1, *ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου*. The aorist marks the sudden assemblage of the crowd.

[4] *Γέεννα*, Gehenna, is a corruption of the Hebrew *Gê Hinnom*, "the valley of Hinnom," outside Jerusalem, which had first been rendered infamous by Moloch worship, then defiled with corpses, lastly saved from putrefac-

them; and the Son of Man would, before the angels of God, confess them who confessed Him before men.

While He was thus addressing them, His discourse was broken in upon by a most inopportune interruption — not this time of hostility, not of ill-timed interference, not of overpowering admiration, but of simple policy and self-interest. Some covetous and half-instructed member of the crowd, seeing the listening throngs, hearing the words of authority and power, aware of the recent discomfiture of the Pharisees, expecting, perhaps, some immediate revelation of Messianic power, determined to utilize the occasion for his own worldly ends. He thought — if the expression may be allowed — that he could do a good stroke of business, and most incongruously and irreverently broke in with the request —

"Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me."

Almost stern was our Lord's rebuke to the man's egregious self-absorption. He seems to have been one of those not uncommon characters to whom the whole universe is pervaded by self; and he seems to have considered that the main object of the Messiah's coming would be to secure for him a share of his inheritance, and to overrule this unmanageable brother. Jesus at once dispelled his miserably carnal expectations, and then warned him, and all who heard, to beware of letting the narrow horizon of earthly comforts span their hopes. How brief, yet how rich in significance, is that little parable which He told them, of the rich fool who, in his greedy, God-forgetting, presumptuous selfishness, would do this and that, and who, as though there were no such thing as death, and as though the soul could live by bread, thought that "my fruits" and "my goods," and "my barns," and to "eat and drink and be merry," could for *many* years to come sustain what was left him of a soul, but to whom from heaven pealed as a terrible echo to his words the heart-thrilling sentence of awful irony, "*Thou fool, this night!*"[1]

tion and pestilence by enormous fires. It thus became a type of all that was terrible and disgusting.

[1] Luke xii. 16–21. It is not indicated, any more than in the case of Dives, that his riches were unjustly acquired: his fault lay in his forgetting the Giver: forgetting that he was but a steward of them; forgetting that the soul cannot live by them; forgetting how soon death might make him relax his grasp of them. It is clear that the reminiscence of Nabal's selfish folly and wretched death was in our Lord's mind. This is shown by the emphatic repetition of the μου (cf. 1 Sam. xxv. 11, and by the

And then our Lord expanded the thought. He told them that the life was more than meat, and the body than raiment. Again He reminded them how God clothes, in more than Solomon's glory, the untoiling lilies, and feeds the careless ravens that neither sow nor reap. Food and raiment, and the multitude of possessions, were not life: *they* had better things to seek after and to look for; let them not be tossed on this troubled sea of faithless care;[1] be theirs the life of fearless hope, of freest charity, the life of the girded loin and the burning lamp — as servants watching and waiting for the unknown moment of their lord's return.

The remarks had mainly been addressed to the disciples, though the multitudes also heard them, and were by no means excluded from their import. But here Peter's curiosity got the better of him, and he asks "whether the parable was meant especially for them, or even for all?"

To that question our Lord did not reply, and His silence was the best reply. Only let each man see that he was that faithful and wise servant; blessed indeed should he then be; but terrible in exact proportion to his knowledge and his privileges should be the fate of the gluttonous, cruel, faithless drunkard whom the Lord should surprise in the midst of his iniquities.

And then — at the thought of that awful judgment — a solemn agony passed over the spirit of Christ. He thought of the rejected peace, which should end in furious war; He thought of the divided households and the separated friends. He had a baptism to be baptized with, and His soul was straitened with anguish till it was accomplished. He had come to fling fire upon the earth, and oh, that it were already kindled! — that fire was as a spiritual baptism, the refining fire, which should at once inspire and blind, at once illuminate and destroy, at once harden the clay and melt the gold.[2]

choice of ἄφρων = *Nabal* (id. ver. 25). The passage, too, offers sufficient resemblances to a beautiful passage in the Son of Sirach (xi. 18, 19) to establish the interesting conclusion of Stier, that our Lord was also familiar with the Apocrypha. In the original Greek of this parable there is a singular energy and liveliness, quite accordant with the mood of intense emotion under which Jesus was speaking.

[1] Luke xii. 29, *μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε*, "Be not like ships that toss in the stormy offing, outside the harbor's mouth."

[2] Luke xii. 50, *πῶς συνέχομαι*. I have seen no perfectly satisfactory explanation of *τί θέλω, εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη*. It seems best to make the *τί θέλω* a question, and regard *εἰ* as equivalent to *εἴθε*, "would that." So those difficult words are understood by Origen (?), Meyer, Stier, Alford, etc., and, as it seems, rightly; though probably there was something far more in these utterances of deep emotion than could be rightly understood.

And here we are reminded of one of those remarkable though only traditional utterances attributed to Christ, which may possibly have been connected with the thought here expressed —

"*He who is near me is near the fire! he who is far from me is far from the kingdom.*" [1]

But from these sad thoughts He once more descended to the immediate needs of the multitude. From the reddening heaven, from the rising clouds, they could foretell that the showers would fall or that the burning wind would blow — why could they not discern the signs of the times? Were they not looking into the far-off fields of heaven for signs which were in the air they breathed, and on the ground they trod upon; and, most of all — had they but searched rightly — in the state of their own inmost souls? If they would see the star which should at once direct their feet, and influence their destiny, they must look for it, not in the changing skies of outward circumstance, but each in the depth of his own heart.[2] Let them seize the present opportunity to make peace with God. For men and for nations the "too late" comes at last.

And there the discourse seems to have ended. It was the last time for many days that they were to hear His words. Surrounded by enemies who were not only powerful, but now deeply exasperated — obnoxious to the immediate courtiers of the very king in whose dominion He was living — dogged by the open hatred and secret conspiracies of spies whom the multitude had been taught to reverence — feeling that the people understood Him not, and that in the minds of their leaders and teachers sentence of death and condemnation had already been passed upon Him — He turned His back for a time upon His native land, and went to seek in idolatrous and alien cities the rest and peace which were denied Him in His home.

[1] Ὁ ἐγγὺς μου ἐγγὺς τοῦ πυρός· ὁ δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας. (Didymus in Ps. lxxxviii. 8.) Traces of the same remarkable saying are found in Orig. Hom. in Jer. iii., p. 778; Ign. *ad. Smyrn.* 4. (See Westcott, *Introduction*, p. 430.)

[2] Cf. Matt. xvi. 2, 3; Luke xii. 54–57. καύσων is the hot wind, קרם "ventus arens" (Jer. in Ezek. xxvii.).

CHAPTER XXXIV.

AMONG THE HEATHEN.

"They that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the Light shined." — Isa. ix. 2.

"Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the regions of Tyre and Sidon."[1]

Such is the brief notice which prefaces the few and scanty records of a period of His life and work of which, had it been vouchsafed to us, we should have been deeply interested to learn something more. But only a single incident of this visit to heathendom has been recorded. It might have seemed that in that distant region there would be a certainty, not of safety only, but even of repose; but it was not so. We have already seen traces that the fame of His miracles had penetrated even to the old Phœnician cities, and no sooner had He reached their neighborhood than it became evident that He could not be hid. A woman sought for Him, and followed the little company of wayfarers with passionate entreaties — "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Thou Son of David: my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil."

We might have imagined that our Lord would answer such a prayer with immediate and tender approbation, and all the more because, in granting her petition, He would symbolically have been representing the extension of His kingdom to the three greatest branches of the Pagan world. For this woman was by birth a Canaanite, and a Syro-Phœnician;[2] by position a Roman subject; by culture and language a Greek; and her appeal for mercy to the Messiah of the Chosen People might well look like the first-fruits of that harvest in which the good seed should spring up here-

[1] Matt. xv. 21–28; Mark vii. 24–30.

[2] The name is somewhat uncertain; it is, perhaps, the opposite of Liby-phœnix — *i.e.*, the Phœnicians of Carthage (cf. *Uterque Poenus*, Hor. *Od.* ii. 2, 11), since the *province* Syro-Phœnice was not created till Hadrian's time. The readings of Mark vii. 26 differ, and Griesbach reads Συρα Φοινισσα. But perhaps Συροφοινικισσα (א, A) is the safest form.

after in Tyre and Sidon, and Carthage, and Greece, and Rome. But Jesus — and is not this one of the numberless indications that we are dealing, not with loose and false tradition, but with solid fact? — "Jesus answered her not a word."

In no other single instance are we told of a similar apparent coldness on the part of Christ; nor are we here informed of the causes which influenced His action. Two alone suggest themselves: He may have desired to test the feelings of His disciples, who, in the narrow spirit of Judaic exclusiveness, might be unprepared to see Him grant His blessings, not only to a Gentile, but a Canaanite, and descendant of the accursed race. It was true that He had healed the servant of the centurion, but he was perhaps a Roman, certainly a benefactor to the Jews, and in all probability a proselyte of the gate. But it is more likely that, knowing what would follow, He may have desired to test yet further the woman's faith, both that He might crown it with a more complete and glorious reward, and that she might learn something deeper respecting Him than the mere Jewish title that she may have accidentally picked up.[1] And further than this, since every miracle is also rich in moral significance, He may have wished for all time to encourage us in our prayers and hopes, and teach us to persevere, even when it might seem that His face is dark to us, or that His ear is turned away.

Weary with the importunity of her cries, the disciples begged Him to send her away. But, as if even *their* intercession would be unavailing, He said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the *house of Israel*."

Then she came and fell at His feet, and began to worship Him, saying, "Lord, help me." Could He indeed remain untouched by that sorrow? Could He reject that appeal? and would He leave her to return to the life-long agony of watching the paroxysms of her demoniac child? Calmly and coldly came from those lips, that never yet had answered with anything but mercy to a suppliant's prayer — "It is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs."

Such an answer might well have struck a chill into her

[1] In Mark iii. 8; Luke vi. 17, we are distinctly told that "they about Tyre and Sidon" were among His hearers, and the witnesses of His miracles: and He had on two separate occasions at least been publicly greeted by the title "Son of David" (Matt. ix. 27; xii. 23).

soul; and had He not foreseen that hers was the rare trust which can see mercy and acceptance even in apparent rejection, He would not so have answered her. But not all the snows of her native Lebanon could quench the fire of love which was burning on the altar of her heart, and prompt as an echo came forth the glorious and immortal answer —

"Truth, Lord; then let me share the condition, not of the children, but of the dogs, for even the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table."[1]

She had triumphed, and more than triumphed. Not one moment longer did her Lord prolong the agony of her suspense. "O woman," He exclaimed, "great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt." And with his usual beautiful and graphic simplicity St. Mark ends the narrative with the touching words, "And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed."

How long our Lord remained in these regions, and at what spot He stayed, we do not know. Probably His departure was hastened by the publicity which attended His movements even there, and which — in a region where it had been His object quietly to train His own nearest and most beloved followers, and not either to preach or to work deeds of mercy — would only impede His work. He therefore left that interesting land. On Tyre, with its commercial magnificence, its ancient traditions, its gorgeous and impure idolatries, its connection with the history and prophecies of His native land — on Sarepta, with its memories of Elijah's flight and Elijah's miracles — on Sidon, with its fisheries of the purple murex, its tombs of once-famous and long-forgotten kings, its minarets rising out of their groves of palm and citron, beside the blue historic sea — on the white wings of the countless vessels, sailing to the Isles of the Gentiles, and to all the sunny and famous regions of Greece and Italy and Spain — He would doubtless look with a feeling of mingled sorrow and interest. But His work did not lie here, and leaving behind Him those Phœnician shrines of Melkarth and Asherah, of Baalim and Ashtaroth, He turned eastward — probably through the deep gorge of the rushing and beautiful Leontes — and so reaching the

[1] Ναὶ, Κύριε· καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια, κ. τ. λ. (Matt. xv. 27), "Yea, Lord; for even the little dogs," etc. The ψίχια may possibly be the ἀπομαγδαλίαι (Ar. *Equit.* 415), or fragments of bread on which the guests wiped their hands (after thrusting them into the common dish), and then flung to the dogs.

sources of the Jordan, travelled southward on its further bank into the regions of Decapolis.[1]

Decapolis was the name given to a district east of the Jordan, extending as far north (apparently)[2] as Damascus, and as far south as the river Jabbok, which formed the northern limit of Peræa. It was a confederacy of ten free cities, in a district which, on their return from exile, the Jews had never been able to recover, and which was therefore mainly occupied by Gentiles, who formed a separate section of the Roman province. The reception of Jesus in this semi-pagan district seems to have been favorable. Wherever He went He was unable to abstain from exercising His miraculous powers in favor of the sufferers for whom His aid was sought; and in one of these cities[3] He was entreated to heal a man who was deaf, and could scarcely speak.[4] He might have healed him by a word, but there were evidently circumstances in his case which rendered it desirable to make the cure gradual, and to effect it by visible signs. He took the man aside, put His fingers in his ears, and spat, and touched his tongue; and then St. Mark preserves for us the sigh, and the uplifted glance, as He spoke the one word, "Ephphatha! Be opened!"[5] Here

[1] For the Leontes and the doubts as to its identification, see *Dict. of Georg.* s. v. "Bostrenus," and Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* iii. 408–410. The reading διὰ Σιδῶνος, "He passed from the regions of Tyre *through* Sidon," in Mark vii. 31, is almost certain. The Codex Sinaiticus here concurs with the Vatican, the Codex Bezae, and the Cod. Reg. Parisiensis. Besides, the privacy which He was seeking could not well be attained by passing southwards, and so through the plain of Esdraelon, by Bethshean, and over the bridge at the southern end of the Lake of Galilee. Perhaps I am wrong in assuming that the worship of Melkarth, etc., lingered on. Mr. Garnett calls my attention to the fact that Lucian (?), *De Deâ Syr.* ix., enumerates only three ἀρχαῖα καὶ μέγαλα ἱρὰ in Syria — those of the Syrian Hera, the Byblian Venus, and Astarte. On the other hand, Melkarth continues to be represented to a late period on coins.

[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* v. 18.

[3] Gerasa, Gadara, Hippos, Pella, Gergesa, Bethshean (Scythopolis) are all said by Pliny to belong to Decapolis; the readings of one or two of the names are corrupt.

[4] Mark vii. 32–37.

[5] More exactly אֶתְפַּתַּח, a sound hardly capable of transliteration into Greek. The conclusion which some have drawn that our Lord ordinarily spoke Greek, and that St. Mark has only preserved for us a few Aramaic words on the rare occasions on which Christ adopted the vernacular language of His people, is very precarious. Most of the Jews of that time, those at any rate who were educated and lived in the great commercial centres, spoke two languages, Greek and Aramaic, to which many of them must have added a colloquial knowledge of Latin; but we have seen reason to believe that the language most commonly used by our Lord was Aramaic (*v. supra*, p. 83).

again it is not revealed to us what were the immediate influences which saddened His spirit. He may have sighed in pity for the man; He may have sighed in pity for the race; He may have sighed for all the sins that degrade and all the sufferings which torture; but certainly He sighed in a spirit of deep tenderness and compassion, and certainly that sigh ascended like an infinite intercession into the ears of the Lord God of Hosts.[1]

The multitudes of that outlying region, unfamiliar with His miracles, were beyond measure astonished. His injunction of secrecy was as usual disregarded, and all hope of seclusion was at an end. The cure had apparently been wrought in close vicinity to the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, and great multitudes followed Jesus to the summit of a hill overlooking the lake,[2] and there bringing their lame, and blind, and mained, and dumb, they laid them at the feet of the Good Physician, and He healed them all. Filled with intense and joyful amazement, these people of Decapolis could not tear themselves from His presence, and — semi-pagans as they were — they "glorified the God of Israel."[3]

Three days they had now been with Him, and, as many of them came from a distance, their food was exhausted. Jesus pitied them, and seeing their faith, and unwilling that they should faint by the way, once more spread for His people a table in the wilderness. Some have wondered that, in answer to the expression of His pity, the disciples did not at once anticipate or suggest what He should do. But surely here there is a touch of delicacy and truth. They knew that there was in Him no prodigality of the supernatural, no lavish and needless exercise of miraculous power. Many and many a time had they been with multitudes before, and yet on one occasion only had He fed them; and moreover, after He had done so, He had most sternly rebuked those who came to Him in expectation of a repeated offer of such gifts, and had uttered a discourse so searching and strange that it alienated from Him many even of His friends.[4] For them to suggest to Him a repetition of the

[1] "It was not drawn from Him," says Luther, "on account of the single tongue and ears of this poor man; but it is a common sigh over all tongues and ears, yea, over all hearts, bodies, and souls, and over all men, from Adam to his last descendant. (Stier, iii. 394.)

[2] Very probably near the Wady Semakh, nearly opposite Magdala.

[3] Matt. xv. 29–39; Mark viii. 1–9.

[4] These points have been (so far as I have observed) universally overlooked.

feeding of the five thousand would be a presumption which their ever-deepening reverence forbade, and forbade more than ever as they recalled how persistently He had refused to work a sign, such as this was, at the bidding of others. But no sooner had He given them the signal of His intention, than with perfect faith they became His ready ministers. They seated the multitude, and distributed to them the miraculous multiplication of the seven loaves and the few small fishes; and, this time unbidden, they gathered the fragments that remained, and with them filled seven large baskets of rope, after the multitude — four thousand in number, besides women and children — had eaten and were filled.[1] And then kindly and peacefully, and with no exhibition on the part of the populace of that spurious excitement which had marked the former miracle, the Lord and His Apostles joined in sending away the rejoicing and grateful throng.

[1] σπυρίδες this time, not small κόφινοι, as in the previous miracle: for the size of them compare Acts ix. 25, where St. Paul is let down the wall of Damascus in a σπυρίς. To suppose, as some have done, that this miracle is identical with the Feeding of the Five Thousand — both being but blurred traditions of one and the same event — is simply to deprive the Evangelists of every particle of historical value. The two miracles differ in almost every circumstance — in time, in place, in numbers, in results, in details; and it is a striking mark of truth, which certainly would not be found in the work of inventors, that the lesser miracle is put after the greater, our Lord's object being to do a work of mercy, not to put forth a display of power.

122